Analyze Options for New Regional Partnership Models

Each small group voted for two models of partnership to evaluate, which could include a model they create themselves. Evaluation for the top two models included wearing a "yellow hat" (everyone provides optimistic ideas of why the model could work and why it's a good idea) or a "black hat" (everyone provides critical ideas of why the model wouldn't work and why we should be cautious about moving forward).

GROUP 5 HYBRID - REGIONAL OCEAN PARTNERSHIP "LIGHT"

Description
- Membership – same as ROP
- Leadership – not as high as Govs
- Meetings – less than ROP
- Activities – smaller action plan; need staff for ROP to do work
- Funding – multiple sources
- Budget estimate - $200k +

Yellow Hat
- Non partisan
- Defined leadership
- Less hierarchy than ROP
- Not state-led
- Seek funding sources
- Validated
- Meaningful results/goal oriented
- Multi-issue/broader issues
- Leverage resources
- More structure to maintain relationships
- Higher level of leadership participation than network
- "Hybrid to include Network yellow hat"

Black Hat
- Costs $$
- Questionable political will
- Need a well defined purpose
- Competing interests/policies
- Needs more nurturing than network (lobbying, advocacy)
- More labor intensive than network
- Needs more TLC
- On the heels of GSAA-fatigue
- No authority to drive policy/goals

GROUP 2 HYBRID – COLLABORATIVE REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP

Description
- Blend of Collaborative and ROP
  - Governors endorse
  - Member driven
- Membership - Selective membership
- Leadership - more like collaborative model
- Meetings - 1 mtg / year
- Activities – blend of collaborative and ROP
- Dues
  - Some dues expected
  - Grants
  - Stay tuned for details
- Budget - $100 – 200k

Yellow Hat
- Governor endorsement gives clout
- Dues and structure give commitment
- Less subject to politics than ROP
- Real project/product outcomes
- Real policy influence
- STAFF
- Annual business meeting
- Viability provides basis for planning
- Commitment of participants

Black Hat
- Greater time commitment
- Limited voting membership/less open
- Requires more money
- Less flexibility/political oversight
- Dues can be disincentives -> members leave -> structure breaks down
- Greater public scrutiny
- Risk of visible failure

Yellow Hat – Group 1
*denotes yellow hat thoughts shared with "network"
- More predictability
- Greater "buy" in
- Explicit role for WGs
- Accountability, can undertake projects
- Pay dues ↑ mission focus
- Decision-making process is transparent
- Better defined leadership
- *Nimble to emerging needs
- *Cheap-ish
- *Less bureaucratic
- *More than "just" info sharing
- *Good: ID of knowledge gaps

Yellow Hat – Group 4
- Structured + committed leadership
- Activities more goal oriented
- "skin in the game"
- dues = greater level of commitment
    o still does not exclude people
- ability to have ad-hoc workgroups – issue flexibility
- legitimacy
    o greater visibility, clout
    o logo marketing
- staff/coordinator – glue that holds us together
- regular meetings
- steady + bigger budget, support mtgs
- lead to more strategic link as group
- opportunity to link mtg w/ other groups
- removal political realm

Yellow Hat – Group 3
- Dedicated staff
- Flexibility w/ annual mtg to shift focus
- "skin in game"
    o membership dues
    o mtg. sponsorship
- ability to write grants, bring resources
- easy transition from GSAA

- fiscal agent
- decision-making via voting, more democratic
- 2 in-person mtgs/funds for travel
- more action oriented

Black Hat – Group 1
- Dues! (no money to join, no political support to join)
- $ could eliminate certain sectors (students)
- steering committee too small
- would need bylaws
- challenge picking right fiscal agent
  - this could hamper flexibility
- can we get enough buyin to earn $ as needed
- # of meetings = a lot (WG, Annual, Conf)
- does this draw in agencies (state/fed)?
- Outcomes undefined
- Needs "gravitas" – steering committee needs right reps

Black Hat – Group 4
- Feds cannot pay dues – limited voice/vote
- More formal = more unwieldy
- Greater resource/time commitment (vs. COP, network)
- Potential to use as special interest w/ $, limit off regs Fed
- Fiscal agent – who? Should there be grants?
- Disquiet between dues paying/others
- Getting people to pay dues
- Spending resources managing money
  - Effort going beyond activities
- Scaling of money brings issues/limited outcomes
- Need to justify $/dues. Leveraging/measure success
- Lack of clarity on budget for conference
- Less structure than ROP

Black Hat – Group 3
- Membership dues
  - May negatively impact network
- Time required to participate/travel to meetings
- Cost more than some of the other models
- Confusion regarding level of "sanction"/authority
- Someone has to be a fiscal agent & there is an associated cost
- Finding staff at $50k may be hard (1/2 time position)
- Managing staff req's "leadership/oversight" person/structure

NETWORK

Yellow Hat – Group 1
*denotes yellow hat thoughts shared with "collaborative"
- All inclusive; = participation
- *Nimble to emerging needs
- Focus on primary topic + priority
- W/out dues -> larger participation
- *Cheap-ish
- *Less bureaucratic
- Flexible engagement and participation
- *More than "just" info sharing
- *Good: ID of knowledge gaps
- Leadership structure targets those w/ time
  - Do it because they want to
- No bylaws

Yellow Hat – Group 5
- Issue focused
- Good cross section of stakeholders
- No fee to be a part of group
- Low resource requirement
- No need for central option
- Process to maintain relationships
- Volunteer members can get tucked into day jobs
- Limited admin burder/cost
- Independent
- Way to implement ROP Light hybrid

Yellow Hat – Group 4
- Practical
- Open membership
- Activity oriented
- Funding flexibility
- Relatively inexpensive/doable funding
- Issue flexibility
- Ability to morph/change
- Structured leadership
- Self directed
- Federal engagement enabled
- Consensus driven

Yellow Hat – Group 3
- Easy lift
- Room to grow "good place to start"
- Annual mtg. <u>in-person</u>
- Maintains relationships
- Budget achievable
- No barrier to entry & no financial commitment

Yellow Hat – Group 2
- Doesn't require Govs
  - Easier to do
  - Less politics
  - No exec charter needed
- Openness/Inclusive
  - Fluid & flexible
- Flexible grant/funding options
- Less reliant on agencies
- Cheap!
- Self-selecting interest & staff level involvement
- Less constrained
- Less effort for individual members

Black Hat – Group 1
- Little/no accountability
- Would need key state/fed participation -> account/commitment
- May not have credibility/gravitas
  - Lacks key leadership
- If all volunteer, may not have all sectors represented
- Hard to secure $
- Redundant? Could existing networks serve function?
- Under-funded or unrealistic. Is this enough for staff?
- Single focus may inhibit interdisciplinary interaction
- Primary focus can change between infrequent mtgs
- How to start up <u>new</u>
- Lack of continuity
  - All volunteer, D'ing primary = flux in commitment and participation

Black Hat – Group 2
- Less stature/recognition
- Sustainability of $
- Limited or no staff

- Limits accomplishments
- May require 3rd party fiduciary
- Lesser organization diminishes commitment & participation
- Grants > actual priorities
- Less clout/weight on recommendations

Black Hat – Group 3
- Narrow focus
- Coordination and progress is potentially slower/harder (no staff?)
- Could put our region at a disadvantage vs. other regions for funding
- May not be eligible for some funding opportunities
- Could effect/limit some state/fed participation
- Erratic funding
- Lack of "legitimacy"; i.e. Gov. blessing

Black Hat – Group 4
- Consensus Driven
  - Lowest common denominator w/ decisions
- Activities do not lead to specific objectives
  - No specific objectives
- Lacks external legitimacy
  - Challenge to sanctioned gov't engagement
- Volunteer leadership
- Potential to duplicate other efforts
- Funding uncertainty
- Could lack commitment from participants
- General uncertainty

Black Hat – Group 5
- No champion
- No $, no support
- Harder to make progress
- Easy to walk away
- Who is driving the train?
- More technical focus
- Workload falls on a few people
- Not as much clout/recognition
- Not as much validation
- No authority

Effectiveness vs. Feasibility Evaluation

Participants were invited to rate options based on their perceived feasibility and effectiveness for achieving the proposed purpose of the partnership. Bottom left quadrant is low feasibility and low effectiveness; top right is high feasibility and high effectiveness.

EACH PARTICIPANT CHOOSES 2

NETWORK

FEASIBILITY	9 X	12 X
	0 X	0 X
	EFFECTIVENESS	

COLLABORATIVE

FEASIBILITY	2 X	8 X
	0 X	0 X
	EFFECTIVENESS	

COLLABORATIVE/ROP HYBRID

FEASIBILITY	0 X	3 X
	0 X	6 X
	EFFECTIVENESS	

ROP LIGHT

FEASIBILITY	0 X	3 X
	1 X	7 X
	EFFECTIVENESS	

EACH PARTICIPANT EVALUATES ALL

NETWORK

FEASIBILITY	14 X	12 X
	0 X	0 X
	EFFECTIVENESS	

COLLABORATIVE

FEASIBILITY	2 X	8 X
	8 X	7 X
	EFFECTIVENESS	

COLLABORATIVE/ROP HYBRID

FEASIBILITY	0 X	2 X
	9 X	14 X
	EFFECTIVENESS	

ROP LIGHT

FEASIBILITY	1 X	4 X
	5 X	12 X
	EFFECTIVENESS	