**What needs to do in terms of Priorities?**

**TIER I**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FUNCTION |  |
| * Foster/Galvanize Communities Across Programs & Disciplines [ BIG FRAMEWORK ] that allows connectedness across geo-scale [in collaboration, iterative]
 | * [[ MARKETING DECISION-MAKING / ADMINISTRATION PRIORITIES / STATE DIRECTOR ]] … look for opportunities to collaborative partnership to local decision-making {not selling a need – selling a collaboration}
 |
| * Channel Energies into specific areas of shared interest (places, challenges/risks, program, etc.)
 | * [[IMPLEMENTATION ‘how to”]]
 |
| * Targeted, Facilitated Transfer of Tools for Application by Partners Who Need/Want it at their scale
 | * [[ VOLUNTEERS TO DEMONSTRATE SUCCESS – deep dive into your organization ]]
 |
| * HOW TO “TELL THE STORY” across the geography (how their contribution contributes to the larger message)
 | * [[ MARKETING – SUCCESS ]]
 |

**TIER II**

* **Process support**
* **Framework for Accountability**
* **Aligned implementation across regional -> local conservation action partnership**

**TIER III**

* **Refreshing blueprint**
* [#1 – Mike] – Why of the Partnership – no need to discuss / we buy in: thus **focus of capacity and interest across the Geography**……see northern, Central, Southern breakdown ….but natural gravitation of north partners (assessing stressors and risk)=>us as a way of galvanizing the partnership. In the south=>TRBN geographic region interest….if aligned could roll-up (organize of similarity => watershed network) vs northern based on risk-assessment.
	+ Q. why 3-regions (in workgroup)
	+ Q. [Bill] – Priority ensure work doesn’t stop …and make sure it’s all connected [LCC breakup isn’t ecological breakup] **“nested networks of partners”** …ex. NEAFWA and SEAFWA … want a FRAMEWORK across Geographic Scales (within respective jurisdictions)
	+ [Rick] EPA regional decision (4-states applcc, most of SALCC, etc….. programmatic activities on the ground. ……Big Pictures (not brought into that regional perspective.)…..SECAS is a promising framework. …makes it easier to talk to people.
	+ [Mike] Provides consistent context – individual priorities can be evaluated to fill out the bigger version… (all have some value to contribute => value)
* [Bill] **still have collaborative piece as a PRIORITY**
	+ The Why – adds up to the common vision – **DIRECTION OF PURPOSE** (only so much energy) … reinforce the network …the choose to channel that energy
* [Bill] **iterative updates based on new information (ex. “delivering” it needs to inform)** – even w/ FW bias\_need commonality of “At Risk Species” ….. “Clean Air, Clean Land, Clean Water” [[Adaptive Management Framework]]
* [David] need Regional Conserv. Design – at a smaller geography….. then to local conservation geography. (ex. Clemson). **Need to go through those FILTERS to test** if it’s right thing at Regional level to go down to fine-scale Need.
	+ [Mike] ….MesoScale Downscaling -- where are the funding coming from
* **[Ray] Tier #1 Forging/Galvanizing the Communities** – it is the overarching role of this Partnership
	+ [Jean] **NETWORK coordination** (downscaling – beyond the capacity )
	+ [Jean] three-prong
	+ [Bill] – roles and responsibility: (LCC=science) what is it going to FORGE that?
	+ [Rick] – not an easy process [we have to have a vision, activities are, focus on the programmatic activities….where does it feed back to the Protection Arena [that’s just an organization level]
	+ [Mike] shifted paradigm – to mainstream into [Time-bound = or some other approach to (process)
* [David] **would be partners** – **don’t understand** the need or the value of the partnership (only those have already done …. (Jim Martin) head out of the sand, not counting fish, what is happening on the landscape that’s going to influence is going to make up successful. (1st) identifying the needs…. Proof of concept out there – now we need to Educate Out to those on the Ground (& how it leads into our protection)….. AWARENESS (targeted) & implication to the trust responsibility … DEDICATED (Targeted, Facilitated, Transfer) … Where and How (demonstrate WINS)…
	+ [David] look at SECAS – SE Directors understand enough so they can support. But few or understand how that needs to be downscale – TO PROVIDE DIRECTION to their staff (HOW TO APPLY THAT BODY OF INFORMATION down the THEIR AREA OF RESPONSIBILY) …how is it informing (decisions….where DOES IT MAKE SENSE) and where do you put resources to building that BRIDGE (on an issue or a geography).
* [Jean Qs on “Issue” [Bill] Issue of LCCs was spatial (are there “**issues”** ….to address issue…divided responsibility across that) …ecological threats vs
	+ [Rick] **ecological attributes** (EPA) --- everyone talks differently – how everyone underlies that values (underlies that value to drive your discussion)
* [David] feedback to channels – Service will do away of this Program – need to overcome that Service Leadership (if that does happen it will). **LANDSCAPE INITIATE – WHY IS IT IMPORTANT AND HOW DO WE COMMUNICATE IT** …(have to find a way to fund this…. Why do we need to fund this if the Service isn’t supporting it.) THE MANAGEMENT APPROACH NOW AND IN THE FUTURE…. too far above where they (no one entity is responsible for that whole system)… adaptively react and be successful in changing what’s been detrimental to the system

**LUNCH DISCUSSION**

* [David] Should be able to see WHY we should do this… classify this work in the realm of R&D … needed to be successful in 10-15 years
* [Ray] Still company – “Marketing Conservation” across the State agencies (but led by FWS – closest to voice of conservation entities and helps States see this.) More of a ‘marketing’ vs. the ‘R&D’ -----
* [Ray] need to acknowledge this is a Service-centric
* [Mike] supporting scalable supporting conservation – allows us to align our programs that both support this new approach as well as need to do during times of shrinking resources. (Cautious when we have to identify what ‘falls off the plate’).
* [Rick] similar alignment challenge – how when leader stepping away (so ‘how to realign those priorities’) …sales and marketing …what is that value (talk about it from a business stand-point.)
* [Bill] shouldn’t do outside of the state priorities …still put the States on the Trajectory to succeed.
* [Jean] help Federal Partners in their alignment …
* [David] (1) Congress isn’t willing to support (2) Appalachian falling between the cracks in the States (3) not a lot of outreach to other agency …Causes FWS to participate (4) new funding: 12-13K species endangered – focus to different approach (1st SWAP that current approach state-by-state isn’t being successful) – Where are leaders at States (west difficult w/ lcc). **SECAS is the approach we need to take.** [Bill Q] SWAP integration taking place need for new tools and partnerships. They can’t meet the challenges by themselves. (See landtrusts, NGO doing in being more)

Marketing the Value – to your (agency) to Value of your Decision-Making [if not, WHY (limiting factor)]… not “conservation value” it’s the Value to Meet your Mission.

This time around – FWS (not just one voice at the table….) it needs to ALIGN THE SERVICES Charge (the other Federal FIT INTO the Voice of the Service) .. REPHRASE: (FWS got the money “we have it” – not through partnership per se (may be a way to inform our decision-making vs. here’s money and help decide where it’s spent.)

[Service – opportunity to capitalize on these investments – to REINFORCE with those priorities that we share (ex. Conservation action JV vs a Bird JV)]

**What new Partnership Needs to look like?**