



Pacific Islands RPB Meeting
February 14-15, 2018
Honolulu, Hawaii

RPB Members in Attendance:

American Samoa: Chris King (alt), Henry Seseapasara	JCS: CAPT Ash Evans (Navy) DOD: Nicole Griffin (USMC)
CNMI: Janice Castro, Mike Tenorio (alt)	EPA:
Guam: Dr. Jason Biggs, Carl Dominguez	DOT:
Hawaii:	DOI: Matt Brown (FWS)
WPFMC:	USCG: Dave McClellan, Nic Jarboe (alt)
NOAA: Michael Tosatto (NMFS)	USDA: Travis Thomason

Others and Public:

Coordinator: Sarah Pautzke
Facilitators: Stefanie Dukes, Stephanie Bennett
Presenters: Deerin Babb-Brott (telephone), Karen Herrera (BOEM), Keith Mattson (CONCUR Inc), Justine Nihipali (Hawaii CZM), Anne Chung (Hawaii DAR), Richard Hall (NOAA PIRO), Dana Goodson (Udall), Valerie Puleo (Udall), Arlene Guest (Naval Postgraduate School (NPS)), Tom Murphree (NPS), Kiya Gornik (Lynker).
Public: Jason Beaman (NMFS), Fiona Langenberger (PacIOOS), Rebecca Walker (WPFMC).

AGENDA OVERVIEW

- PI RPB charter actions
- News from federal level
- Funding
- Stakeholder engagement
- Mid-Point process assessment
- Team reports: Data Team, American Samoa (AS), CNMI, Guam
- Feedback regarding the AS Ocean Plan
- Hawaii presentations
- Co-lead nominations
- PI RPB goals
- Moving forward

The meeting opened with a welcome by the federal co-lead Mr. Tosatto and non-federal co-lead Dr. Jason Biggs. 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 Honolulu, Hawaii on February 14-15, 2018. 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 review 2017 goals, and develop 2018 goals and related directives/recommendations to progress our efforts on these building blocks in the year ahead.

Meeting Outcome #1: Consensus on the PI RPB goals for 2018

Building Block	Goal
Capacity Building	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Finalize American Samoa Ocean Plan2) Continue ocean planning in Guam3) Continue ocean planning in CNMI4) Increase funding support
Data	<ol style="list-style-type: none">5) Transfer data portal prototype to permanent site6) Identify data gaps
Stakeholder Engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none">7) Develop a stakeholder engagement plan for Guam8) Develop a stakeholder engagement plan for CNMI9) Conduct CMSP training in Guam10) Conduct CMSP training in CNMI

Meeting Outcome #2: Review of the PI RPB Mid-Point Process Assessment

The PI RPB was led through a breakout session to provide feedback on the priority actions for the PI RPB over the next couple years based on the results of the mid-point process assessment conducted by Udall Institute for Conflict Resolution. Priority actions identified in small groups included:

- 1) Improved internal understanding of PI RPB goals
- 2) Ensure clear and tailored messaging in CNMI and Guam about the goals for the effort
- 3) Must engage key government leaders in Guam and CNMI
- 4) Identify and engage local staff
- 5) Coordinate with Hawaii to assess how best for Hawaii to engage
- 6) Consider re-examining the proposed timeline

Meeting Outcome #3: Recommendations and directives for the Executive Secretariat.

Regarding the PI RPB charter: The PI RPB adopted a Terms of Reference that will be included as an appendix. The addition of the TOR will be identified in a table in the appendix of the charter.

Regarding capacity: The PI RPB heard about additional support being provided to the PI RPB to develop the budget further and pursue funding options via a Lynker in-kind hire, Kiya Gornik. The PI RPB supported initiation of a finance team to pursue funding opportunities that would directly fund the activities of the PI RPB, its Data Team, and its Ocean Planning Teams. The PI RPB also agreed to complete American Samoa's Ocean Plan ahead of all other activities.

Regarding stakeholder engagement: The PI RPB heard a report about the stakeholder assessment for American Samoa completed by CONCUR. Members are interested in pursuing a similar assessment for both Guam and CNMI should funding be secured.

Meeting Outcome #4: Comment and recommendations to the American Samoa Ocean Planning Team

- 1) The PI RPB recommended the ASOPT consider making *fa’a Samoa* the first goal instead of last.
- 2) The PI RPB recommended the Coordinator review language regarding the role of RPBs to ensure consistency across planning teams, then add this language to the American Samoa Ocean Plan.

MEETING SUMMARY

PI RPB UPDATE

Ms. Sarah Pautzke provided a brief update regarding the status of the prototype mapping interface, the American Samoa Ocean Plan, and the 2018 goals. She then presented suggested 2018 goals. The PI RPB tabled discussion regarding the goals until the following day.

2017 Goals:

Building Block	Goal	Status
Capacity	Complete draft AS Ocean Plan	Complete
Capacity	Begin planning in Guam and CNMI	Complete
Capacity	PI RPB goals and objectives development	Not done
Capacity	ID and increase general funding support for PI RPB capacity	Complete
Data	Mapping interface prototype complete	In progress
Data	ID data gaps for American Samoa and ensure list of gaps is included in the ASOP	Not done
Stakeholder Engagement	Stakeholder assessment in American Samoa	Complete

Future of the National Ocean Policy

Mr. Deerin Babb-Brott, Director of the National Ocean Council (NOC), provided an update from the national level regarding the future of the National Ocean Policy (NOP). The NOC is transitioning to focus on this Administration’s priorities. The focus now is on good government. He elaborated on three elements:

1. Data and information – including data held by agencies but not publicly available. The portals in New England and the Mid Atlantic provide structure for the data and information about how to approach a given resource. The portals and mapping interfaces allow data to be represented such that it is useful. Data also allows you, as a regulator, to get ahead of the curve during project proposals.
2. Maintaining support for regional and local decision-making.
3. Federal coordination.

Mr. Babb-Brott offered that he is excited about the plan coming out of American Samoa. Based on the New England Ocean Plan and Mid Atlantic Ocean Plan, there is no one way to do ocean planning. He also stated that nothing in American Samoa plan is inconsistent with the three issues above. As the administration puts forward new ocean policy, the NOC will communicate to the RPB about priorities.

Discussion

Ms. Pautzke asked how a federal agency at the regional level could get assistance from parent agencies at the NOC level. Mr. Babb-Brott offered that the NOC was not at critical mass because all agency secretarial-level positions haven't been filled. As that happens, agencies will develop capacity. He offered that as agencies gel around their position on ocean planning, they will be able to provide guidance and assistance.

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

Ms. Karen Herrera, BOEM renewable energy specialist, presented an overview on BOEM operations. She described the Hawaii Renewable Energy Taskforce (Task Force) meetings with local and state stakeholders that began in 2012. A Task Force meeting should be scheduled soon.

Hawaii is has received commercial interest in offshore wind energy projects. In order to properly evaluate such interest, Hawaii, in partnership with BOEM, must identify impacts to the environment and consider other ocean uses. Such uses include DOD activity, commercial/recreation/subsistence fishing, cultural practices, tourism, and a variety of other coastal uses. Impacts to the environment include impacts to marine mammals and Endangered Species Act listed species, among others.

Ms. Herrera described that leasing an area for offshore wind is the first step developers take to acquire site control and begin the necessary survey work that would eventually address potential impacts. Because a lease is subject to NEPA requirements, BOEM would conduct NEPA on the potential area that would be leased prior to a lease being issued. Ms. Herrera emphasized that these projects are multi-year endeavors. Hawaii is currently in the area identification of its planning process, which would potentially identify an area that could be suitable for leasing.

Discussion

There was a brief discussion about BOEM jurisdiction. BOEM has jurisdiction on the outer continental shelf (OCS). The OCS generally begins 3 nmi from state shores and extends to 200 nmi, which the territories lack. Thus, BOEM has no authority in the territories. There is conversation ongoing in the Administration to provide authority to the territory of Guam (see [H.R.4239 - SECURE American Energy Act](#)). The group also discussed the feasibility of offshore wind in Hawaii. Ultimately, the companies proposing the project have to ensure that it's economically feasible. BOEM in coordination with other federal, state and local partners will ensure that proposed projects are developed in an environmentally sound manner.

Mr. Tosatto offered that the proposal was a classic case of why this ocean planning effort is relevant – several people were approached for data. Upon review of the submitted proposal, it was unclear what data were used and where the data were obtained, as well as the quality of the data.

Pacific Region Monuments Review

Mr. Richard Hall provided an update on the status of the Pacific Region monuments. Executive Order 13792 called for a review of monument designations under the Antiquities Act, which included the four marine monuments in the Pacific. The Secretary of Interior recommended the Pacific Remote Islands and Rose Atoll boundary areas be amended and the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council (WPFMC) make fishery management decisions in the expansion area as authorized by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The recommendation is currently waiting on the White House decision. The Marianas Trench management plan is complete and its release is pending the White House decision.

Discussion

The group discussed the original size of the monument and the expansion. Mr. Tosatto clarified that the Secretary of Interior did not specify how much to “shrink” the monuments.

PI RPB Member Updates

USCG: CAPT McClellan detailed the Pacific Seacoast study – a waterways study covering Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and the Pacific territories. Local stakeholder input is encouraged. There is also potential for an electronic identification system on Oahu and Guam that would put an electronic vessel signature on a chart via an AIS receiver. If a buoy is destroyed or lost, the electronic signature would still exist. The system has been used in Texas and Florida, and the USCG is looking to implement it in Hawaii and Guam.

USFWS: Ms. Pautzke asked Mr. Matt Brown about the new director of Insular Affairs. Mr. Brown replied that the Secretary of Interior is interested in changing the structure of the agency. The marine portfolio is under Insular Affairs. It remains to be seen how this will play out.

BOEM: Ms. Pautzke asked Ms. Herrera about the SECURE Act. The energy act extends jurisdiction to certain areas, including Guam, and includes feasibility studies for renewable energy. Any wind leasing would be contingent on the studies. However, there has been no recent movement of the legislation.

Discussion

The USCG clarified that the red and green navigational aids have opposite meanings in the U.S. versus European countries (in the US, common navigation is “red right return” – keep the red markers on the right of your vessel when coming into port or up-river. This is reversed internationally). Also, Dr. Biggs asked if the USCG would consider passive vessel identification. CAPT McClellan responded that AIS could be beneficial for Guam.

PI RPB Statement

The PI RPB, in 2017, stated it would move forward with ocean planning unless directed otherwise. Ms. Pautzke brought up renewing the statement and asking if the PI RPB would like to tailor it to talk about ocean economy. **The PI RPB reviewed the statement and concurred it would maintain the 2017 statement**, but not make any new statements unless in the future, the new ocean policy is rolled out in a way that elicits a reaction.

PI RPB CHARTER ACTIONS

New Members

Ms. Pautzke detailed the change in members to the PI RPB, welcoming the new members, and also asked members to provide alternates if possible. Mr. Tosatto offered that federal agencies have departmental representatives, so need to ask formally for alternates. New members include: CAPT McClellan (and alternate CDR Nic Jarboe), Carl Dominguez (Guam), Janice Castro (CNMI), Tony Benavente (CNMI; alternate Mike Tenorio), and Travis Thomason (NRCS).

Terms of Reference

The **PI RPB agreed by consensus to adopt the terms of reference (TOR)**. Next steps include appending the TOR to the charter as well as an appendix that contains a table that tracks when charter changes occur.

FUNDING

Ms. Kiya Gornik was introduced to the PI RPB. Ms. Gornik was hired by Lynker in-kind to provide funding support to the PI RPB. She gave an overview on the PI RPB's funding status, needs, and budget. She described the goal of securing \$500,000 for 2018-2019 PI RPB activities. However, that is based on some assumptions that do not include, for example, travel between islands in CNMI. The listening session budget is an underestimate. The budget also assumes that Guam and CNMI will proceed separately, but will both use a Guam-based facilitator. The budget does not include stakeholder assessments.

Discussion

The PI RPB discussed the remaining Moore Foundation funds and the creation of a finance team. The Moore Foundation provided funding for the ocean planning effort in the Pacific Islands. The PI RPB has agreed that the remaining funds will be used to complete the effort in American Samoa. Thus, additional funds are needed for the ocean planning effort at the regional level, as well as at the territory level for Guam and CNMI, and for the data team. Ms. Gornik is pursuing funding opportunities including private foundations, grants, and agency sources. The PI RPB was supportive of pursuing private foundations, but cautioned us to be careful regarding strings that may be attached from the foundation.

Dr. Biggs suggested looking at the Community of Science website, Pivot, for a list of RFP opportunities.

Without an infusion of funds, the effort of the PI RPB cannot move forward. Thus **the PI RPB agreed through consensus to for a Finance Team**. Ms. Pautzke will be reaching out to PI RPB members for Finance Team membership. The FT will need a team lead, and that lead does not need to be an RPB member.

The tasks of the Finance Team members include reviewing and providing feedback regarding the budget, brain-storming in-kind funding, looking for potential funding opportunities, intel gathering regarding available funding within agencies, narrowing the list of targets (foundations, grants), help develop proposals through input and review, and determine which activities to pitch to whom (facilitation, projects, etc). The PI RPB also offered that the Finance Team should develop a process to determine whether we agree to accept an award – i.e. review of potential strings attached.

PI RPB MID-POINT PROCESS ASSESSMENT

Ms. Dana Goodson and Ms. Valerie Puleo from the Udall Institute for Conflict Resolution presented about the findings of the mid-point process assessment that was completed for the PI RPB. Udall has worked with the Northeast and Mid Atlantic RPBs as well, and funded the stakeholder assessment for American Samoa.

Udall conducted a situation assessment (mid-point process assessment) to determine what works well, the PI RPB's overall progress, and lessons learned. They worked with the PI RPB co-leads, conducted interviews of PI RPB members, and interviewed groups associated with the effort.

There were four themes: 1) initial expectations of the PI RPB varies, 2) participants believe marine planning is beneficial for the region, 3) operational support has contributed to the PI RPB's progress, and 4) there are key challenges to address. The key challenges include the tyranny of distance, a need for sustained RPB member engagement, and clarity around a shared purpose.

Several recommendations were presented for moving forward, including:

- Increased facilitation and admin staff support
- Clarify and provide enhanced support for member roles
- Undertake a 5 step process for establishing regional ocean planning teams
- Seek additional funding sources for key needs
- Develop a PI RPB process map
- Clarify and plan the role for Hawaii
- Consider additional participants

Ms. Puleo and Ms. Goodson facilitated small work group discussions on day 2 of the PI RPB meeting to reflect on the challenges identified, identify additional challenges that may have been missed, and prioritize recommendations. A full summary of the breakout groups can be found as an appendix to this meeting summary.

The break out groups identified the following additional challenges: 1) a lack of general understanding about ocean planning and a need for CMSP training, and 2) culture and politics are not often addressed together and initiatives sometimes do not match local culture.

Priority actions identified in small groups included:

- 7) Improved internal understanding of PI RPB goals
- 8) Ensure clear and tailored messaging in CNMI and Guam about the goals for the effort
- 9) Must engage key government leaders in Guam and CNMI
- 10) Identify and engage local staff
- 11) Coordinate with Hawaii to assess how best for Hawaii to engage
- 12) Consider re-examining the proposed timeline

Priority actions requiring additional financial resources included CMSP training, early stakeholder assessments for Guam and CNMI, bringing lessons learned from American Samoa and Hawaii to CNMI and Guam, travel support, and additional staff support.

Discussion

Several PI RPB members stressed that CMSP training should be revisited periodically; there was agreement that funding should be sought to hold the training this year for Guam and CNMI. There was a strong suggestion to pause ocean planning in Guam and CNMI until the training occurs.

PI RPB members also stressed the importance of completing of the American Samoa plan before doing much more work in other teams so that energy and attention stays focused to the finish line.

AMERICAN SAMOA STAKEHOLDER ASSESSMENT AND LESSONS LEARNED

Mr. Keith Mattson reported out about the results of the stakeholder assessment in American Samoa that was conducted by CONCUR. Mr. Mattson was a sub-contractor on the project. The assessment was conducted in February through May 2017. The assessment was to identify key stakeholders and how to approach them, and then describe engagement opportunities.

Mr. Mattson commented that the American Samoa Ocean Plan (ASOP) needs to be rooted in community values or we risk disinterested and/or agitated stakeholders. The ASOP Team also needs to talk with a broad cross section of stakeholders. Stakeholders need to see themselves in the plan.

There were 7 broad recommendations resulting from the assessment:

- 1) Develop and articulate clear and consistent leadership
- 2) Further refine and communicate clear and compelling purpose for the ASOP
- 3) Develop and use a range of engagement formats to engage villages
- 4) Work with Office of Samoan Affairs and key resource agencies to engage villages
- 5) Frame compelling incentives to different types of stakeholders to fully engage in the ocean planning process
- 6) Devise strategies to anticipate and overcome obstacles that the CONCUR team faced
- 7) Consider Joint Fact Finding sessions to address significant disagreements

Mr. Mattson then presented a follow-on report developed by CONCUR that described lessons learned during the American Samoa effort to help guide a similar effort in Guam and CNMI. Lessons learned included:

- Specific and detailed recommendations for conducting stakeholder assessments and engagement in CNMI, Guam, and elsewhere are in the report
- Methodology suggested in the report are based on the methodology and experience in American Samoa and other projects
- There is an 8-step process recommended that focuses on person interviews
- The report provides options for resource-constrained situations
- Emphasized that an adaptive approach is important

Both reports are available on the PI RPB website. Additionally, the Executive Summary of the American Samoa Stakeholder Assessment is available in Samoan.

Discussion

The PI RPB discussed the stakeholder assessment and lessons learned report. It was specifically stressed that it is important to know who to interview.

TEAM REPORTS

Data Team

Ms. Nicole Griffin talked about the importance of data in ocean planning. She described how the region starts with a vision for the next 50-100 years, then develops goals to achieve that vision based on objectives and data. She described the analogy of the bedroom – you may think you have a blank slate for planning, but then you need to figure out where to put the bed, dressers, and side tables based on access to the hallway, bathroom, closet, window, and electrical outlets.

She described the effort of the Data Team to acquire data for the prototype data portal that was developed by the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS). The Data Team is now searching for a final host for the data portal and has identified PacIOOS and Marine Cadastre as options. Pacific Disaster Center, associated with DOD, has also been identified, but like PacIOOS, would cost money. Additionally, users would be required to apply for accounts. The goal is to have this complete by the end of the fiscal year.

Ms. Arlene Guest and Mr. Tom Murphree reported about the development of the NPS prototype data portal. Ms. Guest walked the PI RPB through a series of “what if” questions: what if a user wanted to

view a data series, what if a user wanted to view the source of the data, etc. The users were identified as everyone – a planner, agency, or project proposer. Ms. Guest provided a hands-on demonstration of the data portal. She also described data sources, including data acquired from American Samoa Department of Commerce.

American Samoa Ocean Planning Team (ASOPT)

Mr. Chris King described the listening sessions that were held in American Samoa in late September / early October 2017. The ASOPT held four meetings in 2017 to work on goals, objectives, and tasks. The listening sessions were held to receive feedback on the goals and objectives, as well as do a small mapping exercise to gain general use information about the waters of American Samoa. Ms. Gretchen Chiques of NOAA Office of Coastal Management is translating the mapping exercise into general data layers for inclusion as figures in the ocean plan.

The goals of the American Samoa Ocean Plan are:

- 1) Healthy coastal and ocean ecosystems
- 2) Sustainable ocean and coastal uses
- 3) Promote *fa'a Samoa*

Each goal has one or more objectives associated with it. The ASOPT will be reviewing feedback from the listening sessions and the PI RPB at its upcoming March 2018 meeting.

Discussion

Mr. Mattson described how top priorities that CONCUR heard about was runoff in streams, trash in the streams, and poaching. He asked if that was addressed in the ASOP. Ms. Pautzke clarified that the ASOP is about planning for multiple uses, not managing pollution or increasing enforcement – those are management activities performed by specific agencies under specific programs (e.g. NOAA's Marine Debris program; AS EPA's pollution program). However, within objectives, actions and tasks may suggest ways in which agencies can work together to address these issues. One of the primary activities in the upcoming March 2018 ASOPT meeting will be ensuring that the objectives and actions are spatial in nature.

The ASOP has buy-in at the local level to an extent. It is the first time communities and stakeholders are really getting a sense about what the ASOP is. The ASOPT is working hard to ensure goals and objectives are translated into Samoan for increased support. There was some concern about increased regulations on property, and communities were assured that was not the case – this effort does not create any new regulations.

Ms. Pautzke lauded Mr. Sesepasara's leadership of the community meetings, as well as Mr. King's on-the-fly translation. It created a seamless back and forth between the communities and the presentation team.

There was a conversation about the sequencing of the goals. Mr. King clarified that the order of the goals did not indicate prioritization. CAPT Evans commented that upon reading the plan, the perception could be that one goal drives another. Optics could be bad if *fa'a Samoa* is very important but discussed last.

There was also a conversation about the role of the PI RPB identified in the ASOP. A review of the Mid Atlantic Ocean Plan and also the Hawaii MACZAC rules to identify language for the ASOP.

PI RPB feedback: **The PI RPB suggests that the ASOPT consider making Goal 3, Promote *fa'a Samoa*, the first goal.**

TASK: Review RPB roles identified in the Mid Atlantic Ocean Plan. Also review how MACZAC identifies various roles.

CNMI Ocean Planning Team

Ms. Janice Castro reported out about the CNMI Ocean Planning Team (OPT) kick-off meeting held in October 2017 in Saipan. She described how most people were new to this type of process who attended and did not know why they were being invited to participate. She then talked about how the Saipan Lagoon Use Management Plan (SLUMP) has been a heavy focus on Saipan because that is where a lot of uses are concentrated. The SLUMP is finalized and they are now implementing the plan. The various SLUMP participants are coming to consensus currently about who is accountable for which parts of the plan. At the kick-off meeting, Ms. Castro described to participants that the ocean planning effort is similar to the SLUMP effort, but extends from coast to the EEZ. Ms. Castro is the CNMI OPT team lead.

Discussion

Mr. Mattson asked if there was a single purpose that brought the people to the planning table. Ms. Castro responded that the PI RPB members from CNMI (i.e. Ms. Castro and Mr. Benavente) worked with Ms. Pautzke to identify the first cut of invites. The CNMI OPT then reviewed the list at the kick-off meeting to recommend additional people/agencies to invite. They also agreed to follow up with people who'd initially been targeted but did not attend the meeting.

Ms. Pautzke further clarified the "single purpose" part of the question. At the CNMI OPT kick-off meeting, members fill out a worksheet that asks a series of questions about uses and jurisdiction to address uses as well as resources. Attendees had a much better idea about the purpose of ocean planning after filling out the worksheet.

Mr. Tosatto also offered that the territorial government is coming to the table voluntarily, but federal partners are obligated to attend due to the National Ocean Policy Executive Order.

It was also clarified that although the SLUMP has been around for a long time, the NOP allowed the rest of the pieces to come together to promote planning beyond the lagoon. Additionally, it may have been a recommendation of the last 5-year coastal management review.

Guam Ocean Planning Team

Mr. Carl Dominguez described the Guam Ocean Planning Team kick-off meeting. Bureau of Statistics and Plans (BSP) is the lead planning agency for the Guam OPT, and Mr. Dominguez is the lead of the Guam OPT. Dr. Jason Biggs also helped lead the team based on his extensive experience as a PI RPB member. Attendees included people from Port Authority, Army Corps of Engineers, Navy, National Park Service, NOAA, and more, as well as several employees from BSP, which houses the Guam Coastal Zone Management Program.

Invitees attended with an open mind and ready to participate. The first day was a learning process, including examples of ocean planning in other regions and how ocean planning can help ameliorate conflicts in Guam. The participants did a vision exercise to identify the pros and cons of a coastal and marine spatial plan. They also talked about data portals. The hope is that with Guam OPT members'

help, we fundraise on Guam to help with the ocean planning initiative, particularly because the chief planner, Lola Leon-Guerrera, has a full plate and the Guam government is in austerity measures.

Hawaii

Ms. Justine Nihipali gave a brief history of the Hawaii Ocean Resource Management Plan (ORMP) and described the ORMP dashboard. The dashboard was developed to track the progress of the ORMP priority objectives and tasks within them. The PI RPB discussed with Ms. Nihipali how they could help on the tasks identified in Priority 11, which is specific to working with the PI RPB and integrating coastal and marine spatial planning in Hawaii's work. Ms. Nihipali responded that the first conversation should be around what the state's need for CMSP is as well as how the military fits in. The internal process for the next iteration of the ORMP began this year, and engagement with agencies will occur after November 2018.

Ms. Anne Chung, with Hawaii Department of Aquatic Resources (DAR), presented about the Hawaii 30 by 30 Plan, which is the Sustainable Hawaii Initiative that focuses on managing 30% of Hawaii's nearshore waters by 2030. In five areas, DAR is the lead on marine management. Hawaii is dependent on a healthy nearshore marine ecosystem for cultural, economic, and recreational reasons. The nearshore environment is a drive of Hawaii's tourism economy. Further, protecting the nearshore resource through effective management (no closures) is critical to ensuring a functioning ecosystem that sustains livelihoods, provides food resources, is culturally significant, and supports recreation and tourism. Drivers for the 30x30 plan is recent back-to-back coral bleaching events and declines in resource fish populations. The vision is *a healthy nearshore ecosystem and abundant fish, which allows the people of Hawaii and our visitors to enjoy nearshore waters, support local livelihoods, and feed their families*. The goal is to *effectively manage at least 30% of Hawaii's nearshore marine areas by 2030 to ensure a healthy nearshore ecosystem and fisheries that sustain our people and economy*. Objectives include statewide rules, spatial planning, encouraging responsible behavior, and comprehensive monitoring. Nearshore marine areas include the Main Hawaiian Islands state waters. Inland areas will be addressed through collaboration.

Discussion

Ms. Chung clarified that to define sustainable, the group working on the Hawaii 30x30 plan is developing biological, social, and economic indicators. Spatial software will be used to synthesize the spatial data. There is also an aim to encourage responsible behavior through monitoring programs for measuring metrics of the ecosystem.

A communications plan is being developed that include campaigns and actions to promote positive behaviors. There are 3 phases: 1) develop a guiding framework, 2) spatial analysis, and 3) refining and developing management actions. The software cannot tell people what to do, but can provide guidance to partners regarding implementation.

The 30% covers about 11% of the coastline, with 1% being no-take. There will be several zones. The software will be used to run scenarios.

There are no funds attached to this effort. It is being executed solely with existing energy and staff. Additionally, there are no funds for implementation.

Ms. Pautzke and Ms. Chung reflected that it's important to work together. The PI RPB could be involved, but we need to discuss how; perhaps through the steering committee. There are ways in which we can support each other, but a follow-up meeting is necessary.

TASK: Ms. Pautzke will follow up with Ms. Chung about how the PI RPB activities and Hawaii 30x30 plan can be better integrated.

Team membership

Ms. Pautzke reviewed the structure of the PI RPB and the PI RPB teams. Hawaii does not yet have an Ocean Planning Team. The Finance Team is just being formed; Ms. Pautzke asked for volunteers. Ms. Pautzke passed around spreadsheets asking for PI RPB alternates as well as team members. The filled out tables are in the appendix at the end of this summary.

Discussion

Finance Team: There is a time commitment for writing. For example, there may be 3 months of a push, then a switch to maintenance mode. A PI RPB member does NOT need to be the team lead.

TASK: Data Team: Tom and Arlene should be moved to "Others" because they are not federal.

TASK: Flow Chart: Add arrows to indicate relationships.

TASK: Finance Team: PI RPB members solicit input from your jurisdiction and agencies for Finance Team members and team lead by April 1 (March 1 in meeting, Ms. Pautzke amended this date while writing this summary). PI RPB members email Ms. Pautzke names and identify if the name(s) being submitted are capable of being team lead.

TASK:

NOAA - Mr. Tosatto will identify an alternate and notify the coordinator.

DOD - Ms. Griffin will identify an alternate and notify the coordinator after internal approval by DOD.

DECISION: PI RPB Co-Lead Nominations

Mr. Mike Tosatto accepted the federal co-lead nomination.

Dr. Jason Biggs (Guam) accepted the non-federal co-lead nomination.

2018 Goals Discussion

The PI RPB members discussed modifying the proposed 2018 goals. The American Samoa representatives stressed the importance of goal #1: completing the American Samoa Ocean Plan. Input received was that beginning or continuing other efforts should not be at the peril of not finishing the ASOP.

Goal 6: recraft to have a list of identified data needs for American Samoa (AS). The data analysis can be the action in the plan itself. Mr. Tosatto commented that the data goal for AS is necessary, but the issue is what goes into the appendix. CAPT Evans said that the work plan for AS can include looking at data gaps annually once the plans are implemented.

Goal 5, complete the data portal prototype, and goal 7, identify a mapping interface and start populating with data, seem similar. Yet, they are different because the data from the portal goes into the mapping interface. Thus, the data portal must be built separately. The first is the catalog of data; the second is the visualization of that data.

There was also discussion about stakeholder engagement versus assessment. The assessment is needed for stakeholder engagement to occur.

DECISIONS:

- **Scratch goal 3, PI RPB CMSP goals and objectives development.**
- **Change goal 5 to “transfer prototype data portal to permanent site” from “data portal prototype completed.”**
- **Change goal 6 to “Identify data gaps”**
- **Added 4 goals to Stakeholder Engagement: Stakeholder Assessment for Guam, Stakeholder Assessment for CNMI, CMSP training for Guam, CMSP training for CNMI.**

2018 GOALS:

Building Block	Goal
Capacity Building	1) Finalize American Samoa Ocean Plan 2) Continue ocean planning in Guam 3) Continue ocean planning in CNMI 4) Increase funding support
Data	5) Transfer data portal prototype to permanent site 6) Identify data gaps
Stakeholder Engagement	7) Develop a stakeholder engagement plan for Guam 8) Develop a stakeholder engagement plan for CNMI 9) Conduct CMSP training in Guam 10) Conduct CMSP training in CNMI

TIMELINE FOR 2018

The PI RPB discussed its timeline for 2018. Mr. Tosatto said that he hopes to bring capacity to scope and draft for CNMI and Guam in 2018. Mr. Matt Brown commented that the effort is underway with monuments, but the concern is how far along that effort is. If the PI RPB has additional time, we can tap into that constituency plan. Another comment was that efforts should be paused in CNMI and Guam until local buy in can be obtained and CMSP training can occur.

Regarding PRIA, the PI RPB discussed pre-scoping in 2018 and scoping in 2019. Hawaii is putting resources towards this.

The PI RPB discussed and agreed on striking the PI RPB row.

DECISION:

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
American Samoa	Scope	Draft	Draft review	Finalize/endorse		
CNMI		Kick-off / scope	Scope / draft	Review		
Guam		Kick-off / scope	Scope / draft	Review		
Hawaii			Listen			
PRIA		Listen	Pre-scope	Scope		
Regional						

2018 Calendar:

- March 7-9: ASOPT in-person
- April 12-13: CNMI OPT in-person
- April 16-17: Guam OPT in-person
- June/July: ASOPT listening sessions?
- Data Team teleconference?
- PI RPB teleconference?
- PI RPB in-person? Maybe October?

There was conversation about the next PI RPB meeting occurring in sequence with the CMSP training in Guam or CNMI, and that it could dovetail with the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council meeting that is slated for October in the Marianas. That would allow us to leverage travel funding.

Last note: CAPT Evans is retiring.

TASK: CAPT Evans will introduce his replacement to the group (via email, teleconference, or in-person) and will also get that contact information to Ms. Pautzke.

TASK SUMMARY:

- 1) Review RPB roles identified in the Mid Atlantic Ocean Plan. Also review how MACZAC identifies various roles. (Pautzke)
- 2) Ms. Pautzke will follow up with Ms. Chung about how the PI RPB activities and Hawaii 30x30 plan can be better integrated.
- 3) Data Team: Tom and Arlene should be moved to “Others” because they are not federal. (Pautzke)
- 4) Flow Chart: Add arrows to indicate relationships. (Pautzke)
- 5) Finance Team: PI RPB members solicit input from your jurisdiction and agencies for Finance Team members and team lead by April 1 (March 1 in meeting, Ms. Pautzke amended this date while writing this summary). PI RPB members email Ms. Pautzke names and identify if the name(s) being submitted are capable of being team lead.
- 6) NOAA - Mr. Tosatto will identify an alternate and notify the coordinator.
- 7) DOD - Ms. Griffin will identify an alternate and notify the coordinator after internal approval by DOD.
- 8) CAPT Evans will introduce his replacement to the group (via email, teleconference, or in-person) and will also get that contact information to Ms. Pautzke.

APPENDIX:

Mid-Point Process Assessment Facilitated Discussion on Challenges and Recommendations

The Udall Foundation presented the results of the Mid-Process Assessment for the Pacific Islands Regional Planning Body (PIRPB) on Day 1 of the PIRPB meeting. The results detail key findings and recommendations for ocean planning in the Pacific Islands region. On Day 2, the Udall Foundation facilitated small work group discussions to reflect on the challenges identified, identify additional challenges that may have been missed, and prioritize recommendations.

CHALLENGES

The challenges identified in the mid-process assessment, discussed during the presentation portion of Day 1, and highlighted in the small groups during Day 2 are the following:

- **Clarity around a shared purpose** is needed. There were a few areas of disconnect where it was unclear if the full RPB shared the same sense of purpose. These seemed to stem from the issue of turnover on the RPB, and difficulty of articulating the value of ocean planning at the jurisdictional level.
- Need for **jurisdictional level ownership** and engaging key leaders early. It is important to determine whether all the key decision makers and leaders are engaged in this initial step. Groups also discussed the importance of identifying the territory state planner and to gaining his/her commitment. This step requires an initial ongoing investment of time and resources to be done well.
- Need for **early stakeholder assessment** to help focus the efforts, and use lessons learned from Hawaii and American Samoa. In American Samoa, funding for the stakeholder assessment only became available after the American Samoa Ocean Planning Team (ASOPT) had already begun its work. By the time it was being finalized, the ASOPT had already developed a timeline and work plan, conducted listening sessions, and developed plans for more. The groups noted that careful attention to sequencing will be important in Guam and CNMI.
- **Communicating locally** that ocean planning is not regulatory is difficult, and messaging this to different audiences early on is important. The perception that ocean planning is a federally driven effort can cause local stakeholders to be hesitant about engaging.
- **Insufficient funding** for key needs causes additional challenges. Several members shared that internal funding for travel is limited or non-existent, funding for additional staff capacity and expertise would be beneficial, and CMSP training is important.
- **Perceived need for a specific timeline** could push timeline faster than conditions allow. There was concern that pushing ahead without obtaining appropriate local ownership and syncing stakeholder engagement with ocean planning could present additional challenges in the long run. There is a tension between moving ahead quickly and slowing down to gain buy in. The option of potentially halting work was raised during the small work group discussion and debrief.

In the small work groups, participants identified the following **additional challenges** that were not listed in the mid-process assessment:

- Lack of general understanding about ocean planning, and the need for training in CMSP.
- Culture and politics are often not addressed together, and sometimes initiatives do not match the local culture.

The following challenges were identified in the mid-process assessment report, but were not discussed in detail during the small group brainstorming session.

- The **“tyranny of distance”** is unique to the Pacific Islands region. Many interviewees noted that close geographical proximity of the states involved in the Mid Atlantic or Northeast processes was one of the reasons those entities could move forward with their activities at a faster pace. Travel for in-person meetings requires significant funding and staff time. Additionally, technological capacities for videoconferencing and teleconferencing are varied between the jurisdictions. Bandwidth limitations have prevented video conferencing being a reliable option, especially for longer meetings.
- Sustained **RPB member engagement** is needed and RPB member participation has varied. Members have other significant responsibilities that often take precedence over the tasks of the RPB, and the RPB role is an additional role that members take on, while also working to fulfill their full-time duties in their respective agencies. Turnover of individuals on the RPB is also a challenge, and it is difficult to get new members up to speed on the work that has taken place
- Uncertainty of federal ocean policy and degree of continued agency involvement was identified in the interviews and reflected in the report. However, the National Ocean Council provided an update to the RPB during Day 1 on the federal direction, so this challenge may not be as pertinent at this stage.
- Lack of **coordination with non-US neighbors** could undermine the goal of truly implementing regional ocean planning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

After identifying the top priority challenges, the small groups engaged in a brainstorming session about what actions the PIRPB could take to address the challenges. The recommendations were grouped into two categories: 1) activities that can be accomplished with the existing resources and 2) activities that will need funding. The latter is intended for use by the fundraising subcommittee and the contracted fundraising specialist to strategize efforts.

Existing Resources

Using existing resources, the priority action items that were identified are the following:

- **Improve internal understanding of RPB goals.** The mid-process assessment report recommended having a clear overview document and orientation materials to help improve understanding. Recognizing there has been member turnover, it may be worthwhile to have renewed conversations on the RPB on this topic to ensure the group is on the same page and members are communicating a common message. Another option would be to pair newer members with current members to help bridge gaps in understanding. Some of these steps could be undertaken with existing staff, while others may need additional staff support (see “Priorities for Fundraising” below).
- **Ensure clear and tailored messaging in CNMI and Guam about the goals of the effort** to demonstrate the local benefits and value of ocean planning. To develop this messaging, the RPB and jurisdictional planning teams could focus early conversations on this topic and work with local partners and key stakeholders to refine it. Participants noted that it is not necessary to re-invent the wheel when launching efforts in new jurisdictions and that the RPB could refer to existing ocean plans to help develop messaging.
- **Engage key government leaders in Guam and CNMI.** This recommendation was also listed in the mid-process assessment as part of the 5-step process for the jurisdictions. Participants

highlighted the need to make convening calls to key local leaders to assess interests and concerns, and clearly explain what the effort is intended to do. Taking additional time during this stage is essential for a smoother and efficient process in the long term.

- **Identify and engage local staff**, including city and territory planners in CNMI and Guam, to help with on-the-ground coordination and support local participation.
- **Coordinate with Hawaii to assess how best for Hawaii to engage** and to explore how the jurisdictional plans might best fit together as part of a regional plan.
- **Consider re-examining the proposed timeline** and decreasing the work if needed was another option cited by a couple of the participants during the workshop.

Priorities for Fundraising

Priority actions that will need additional financial resources are the following:

- **CMSP training** was identified as the top fundraising priority, and needed before the kickoffs in each jurisdiction. This issue was identified in the interviews for the assessment and in the small work groups as being helpful for understanding what is required for ocean planning and providing a shared learning opportunity. This training could also help to launch the stakeholder assessment by bringing in key local stakeholders (i.e., liaisons and/or ocean resource stakeholders¹) who could help with subsequent outreach to local communities.² The groups identified the need for training in a tailored form for the following groups:
 - RPB members
 - Jurisdictional teams
 - Stakeholders
- **Conduct an early stakeholder assessment in CNMI and Guam** to focus planning efforts, identify stakeholders, and plan for stakeholder engagement throughout the planning process.³
- **Bring lessons learned from Hawaii and American Samoa to the other jurisdictions** through coordination efforts and bringing representatives to the other jurisdictions to speak to their experience.
- **Secure travel support** for in-person meetings.
- **Acquire additional staff support** for the RPB and ocean planning teams as follows:
 - **Administrative and facilitation support for the PIRPB** to allow the executive secretary to invest time in the strategic direction of the RPB and sub-regions, build key relationships, and develop needed support documents.
 - **A process facilitator** to help bring clarity to the process steps, which would help the RPB members and external partners understand the direction of the RPB and their role in that process. The facilitator could also provide enhanced support to RPB members by:
 - Facilitating a conversation around defining and clarifying the role of RPB members

¹ See CONCUR's *Stakeholder Assessment and Engagement for Ocean Planning: Lessons Learned from American Samoa and Recommendations for Future Ocean Planning Teams*, page 6, for definitions of these terms.

² This event could also include stakeholder engagement training component to help jurisdictional teams and RPB members understand the goals of stakeholder engagement, the steps in the assessment process, and how the information gathered can be integrated into the jurisdictional ocean plans.

³ RPB members could refer to *Stakeholder Assessment and Engagement for Ocean Planning: Lessons Learned from American Samoa and Recommendations for Future Ocean Planning Teams* for a step-by-step guide to stakeholder assessment in the jurisdictions.

- Developing an overall Pacific Islands-focused process map
 - Supporting ongoing communication and information-sharing with RPB members, given that meetings occur infrequently
 - Helping develop and implement a new member onboarding process
 - Tracking a shared list of action items and assignments
- **Local coordinators based in the jurisdictions.**⁴ The American Samoa stakeholder assessment process identified the need for an on-the-ground ocean planning team coordinator. The ASPOT had recommended this early on but resources to support a coordinator were not available for the American Samoa process.

⁴ As discussed in the mid-process assessment, the RPB might also consider bringing on contractors to provide expertise needed in the jurisdictions, such as technical planning expertise.

PI RPB Members and Alternates

Agency/Jurisdiction	Member	Alternate
Hawaii	Leo Asuncion	
Hawaii	Suzanne Case	Bruce Anderson
Guam	Carl Dominguez	Lola Leon Guerrero
Guam	Jason Biggs	
CNMI	Janice Castro	Richard Salas
CNMI	Tony Benavente	
American Samoa	Claire Poumele	Chris King
American Samoa	Henry Seseapasara	Selaina Tuimavave
WPFMC		
NOAA	Mike Tosatto	Will identify and notify
DOD	Nicole Griffin	Will identify and notify
CJCS	Ash Evans	Address later
EPA	John McCarroll	Hudson Slay
NRCS	Travis Thomason	Tony Ingersoll
USCG	Dave McClellan	Nic Jarboe
DOT	Bob Loken	
DOI	Matt Brown	

Non-Federal Team Members

Jurisdiction	Data Team	ASOPT	Guam OPT	CNMI OPT
CNMI	Bradley Eichelberger, Francisco Villagomez, David Benavente, Rodney Camacho, Stanley Iakopo			
Guam	Edwin Reyes, Jesse Rojas, Lyza Johnston, Maria Kottermair, Romina King, Jason Biggs, Lola Leon Guerrero			
American Samoa	Gina Faiga, Edgar Apulu, Sandra Lutu			
Hawaii	Justine Nihipali, Joan Delos Santos, Patrick Grady, Bruce Anderson			
WPFMC	Becky Walker	Nate Ilaoa, Christinna Lutu-Sanchez, Krista Corry	Carl Dela Cruz, Felix Reyes	Jack Ogomuro
Others	PacIOOS: Jim Potemra NPS: Arlene Guest, Tom Murphree			