

EVALUATION REPORT

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Enforcement Summit

August 3, 2010, Washington, DC

This report provides an evaluation of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Enforcement Summit on August 3, 2010. The evaluation findings are based on the workshop participants' responses to a questionnaire administered by the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. Of the 78 participants, 24 completed an evaluation questionnaire, a 31% response rate.

Through the use of descriptive statistics (including the mean, median, standard deviation and percent frequencies) this report summarizes respondents' feedback. For a series of questions, the respondents are asked to provide a rating based on a 0-10 scale labeled at the midpoint and the endpoints (i.e., where a "0" means "do not agree at all", a "5" means "moderately agree" and a "10" means "completely agree"). To help the reader interpret the findings, the ratings are collapsed into four levels of agreement:

0 - 10 Rating Scale

Not at all		Weakly			Moderately to mostly			Very much so		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

The four levels of agreement are suggested interpretations; we strongly encourage the reader to draw their own conclusions based on the data provided.

Responses to open-ended questions are provided in full in this report. Consistent with the U.S. Institute's evaluation data management and confidentiality protocols, the information is reported without reference to the identity of individual respondents.

What were the key meeting/workshop objectives? (Q1)

- *Bring together enforcement with fishery participants and NGO's to resolve differences and chart a course "moving forward".*
- *Industry compliance, setting enforcement priorities.*
- *Provide input to NMFS.*
- *Improve relationships/communications.*
- *A listening session for NOAA to get input from around the country.*
- *I think it was simply a press event that NOAA was hoping to have occur and see to its conclusion. NOAA wants nothing to change.*
- *Improve relations between fish industry and NOAA as regulatory body.*
- *Communication with the enforcement community; gain insight and ideas for improving enforcement.*
- *Invite key industry representatives to discuss fisheries law enforcement.*
- *Identified importance to CEA's with states. Identified lack of funding to state's agreement.*
- *Bring together range of people to identify opportunities. NOAA's improving its enforcement program.*
- *Assist NOAA in improving compliance, developing strategies to advance effectiveness of L/E programs. Improve communications with partners. Improve transparency.*
- *To discuss IG's audit of NOAA OLE NE region and improvement of OLE performance nationwide.*
- *To bring several aspects of NOAA, the seafood industry, constituents, NGO's together to discuss NOAA Law Enforcement issues.*
- *To align NOAA OLE policies, procedures and penalties with management objectives such that they are perceived as fair and effective by the fishing community*
- *Explanation of NOAA enforcement. Organization for the future.*
- *A discussion among key stakeholders regarding NOAA's management and enforcement of marine resources.*
- *To decide what direction NOAA Office of Law Enforcement was to undertake.*

- *Improve relationships between NOAA and the regulated community.*
- *To gather input and ideas from a broad group of constituents to help NOAA move forward.*
- *Improve dialogue on enforcement issues between recreational and commercial and NOAA personnel.*
- *Review and make recommendations regarding NOAA OLE and NOAA GC handling of fishery violations including the review protocols by NOAA Leadership.*
- *Explore potential way ahead for NOAA Enforcement.*

Please rate your agreement with the following statements ¹ (Q2a-i)	n	Mean ² (Std. Dev)	Median	Distribution of Responses Percent (%) of Respondent Ratings										
				Not at all		Weakly			Moderately to Mostly			Very Much So		
				0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
The topic of this meeting/workshop is important to my organization. (2a)	24	8.50 (2.30)	10.00	4%		0%				21%			75%	96%
The meeting/workshop was well organized. (2b)	24	8.00 (1.87)	8.50	0%		4%				33%			63%	96%
The facilities were suitable for the meeting/workshop activities. (2c)	24	6.96 (2.77)	7.50	4%		17%				29%			50%	79%
The presentation/delivery of materials was effective in reaching the meeting/workshop objectives. (2d)	24	7.04 (2.16)	7.50	4%		4%				42%			50%	92%
The materials were a valuable supplement to the meeting/workshop. (2e)	24	6.33 (2.26)	7.00	4%		21%				38%			37%	75%
The facilitator(s)' interaction with the participants added value to the meeting/workshop. (2f)	24	7.58 (1.59)	7.00	0%		0%				54%			46%	100%
The presenter(s)' interaction with the participants added value to the meeting/workshop. (2g)	23 N/A=0	7.13 (1.52)	7.00	0%		5%				52%			43%	95%
The meeting/workshop attendees were able to participate effectively. (2h)	24	7.46 (2.00)	8.00	0%		13%				33%			54%	87%
This meeting/workshop was an important opportunity for the exchange of experience and information. (2i)	24	7.71 (1.97)	8.00	0%		8%				33%			58%	91%

¹ Ratings are based on an 11-point end-defined scale, where a "0" means "Do not agree at all," a "5" means "moderately agree" and a "10" means "Completely agree".

² The means, medians and standard deviations are used to represent the average and typical spread of values of variables. Note that when data show great variability and, in general, the distribution of responses to questions is not Gaussian normal (i.e., a bell shaped curve), traditional measures of central tendency such as the mean can be misleading.

Please rate the extent to which the key meeting/workshop objectives were achieved. (Q3)	Valid Percent and Number of Responses		
Progress made on <i>all</i> or <i>most</i> key issues.	33% (n=8)	87% (n=21)	Progress made
Progress made on <i>some</i> key issues.	54% (n=13)		
We ended the process without making much progress.	13% (n=3)	13% (n=3)	No progress made

Additional Comments:

Progress made on all or most key issues:

- *Progress on all in that it was a constructive dialogue and a solid start to the process of making changes.*
- *Some progress was made on some key objectives.*

Progress made on some key issues:

- *Priority setting not finalized.*

We ended the process without making much progress:

- *No comments*

Comments given without rating progress made:

- *No comments*

What were the most beneficial aspects of this meeting/workshop and why were they important to you? (Q4)

Most beneficial aspects:

- *No Confrontation.*
- *Some positive interaction.*
- *Breakout groups.*
- *Networking with people from other areas and back grounds to see if they have similar problems.*
- *NMFS leadership present and listening.*
- *Prioritizing important key elements for NMFS.*

Why they are important to you

- *Gained valuable insight and feedback from industry.*
- *Improve relations.*
- *Can't do everything without resources.*

- *Presentations by Risenhoover and Greenberg important because show that things are changing.*
- *Getting interested stakeholders in same room talking.*
- *We had the meeting as was promised.*
- *Maybe some industry reps had their opinions of LE swayed a bit?*
- *Show the need for NOAA enforcement leader to have fisheries enforcement background.*
- *Good range of people.*
- *Discussion was thoughtful, constructive and respectful.*
- *Good ideas emerged.*
- *Cross sections/diversity of partners in attendance.*
- *Great job on most tables mixing state-federal-fishermen.*
- *Excellent job in providing civil respectful dialog.*
- *All regions were included via invitees.*
- *Simply to get the various factions talking openly and freely about NOAA Law Enforcement issues and misconceptions.*
- *NOAA strongly signaled willingness to address enforcement issues.*
- *Presentations and follow up question and answer.*
- *Sharing across table of very different points of view.*
- *In order to make objectives clear.*
- *Learning curve too great for someone who has no experience in Fish and Wildlife enforcement.*
- *Things, interests came together and heard from each other.*
- *This approach helpful.*
- *Progress can move forward more effectively.*
- *Enabled different views from within and external to NOAA.*
- *Enabled participants to learn from each other.*
- *Enable participants to focus on issues, solutions instead of dwelling on history.*
- *Regional differences re: perceptions of OLE's effectiveness became apparent i.e., the northeast experience was not common to the other regions.*
- *Too much misinformation is spread through the media.*
- *NE Fisheries heavily rely on compliance - community buy -in is essential.*
- *Diverse perspectives from experts.*

- *It put together a large group of people with broad range of seafood experience.*
- *Very clear that biggest problems are isolated geographically.*
- *Problems are politically charged and motivated.*
- *Opportunity to interact in small group setting with other participants.*
- *Mixture of different perspectives in small group setting.*
- *Gaining an understanding of the issues that created the need for the actions.*
- *Gathering of diverse experts in field.*
- *A broad range of experience gives more ideas.*
- *Problems and issues are not universal or widespread across OLE or GCEL.*
- *Politics are driving too many decisions rather than sound judgment and common sense.*
- *Encourages dialog and understanding.*
- *Encourages exchange of ideas and thinking outside the box.*
- *Improperly designed response will cause great harm to the west coast enforcement approach that relies on state/federal partnerships and coordination.*
- *Very rare opportunity to have such a diverse group in the same room.*

What follow-up would you like to see happen after this meeting/workshop? (Q5)

- *Steps taken by NOAA/OLE implementing recommendation at summit.*
- *In 3 to 6 months would like to see if there have been any changes based on input from the meeting.*
- *Summarize on web results.*
- *Many more meetings plus let industry in on the final discussions!!!*
- *Work with implementation of certain objectives.*
- *Follow-up meetings.*
- *Ball is in NOAA's court to engage partners as it moves forward. Naysayers waiting to say this was a meeting about words only - NOAA needs to demonstrate action.*
- *Follow up meeting perhaps in 2 years.*
- *NOAA NE Fishery Science Center has struggled with similar perception/procedure issues and made some progress to address. I would like to see a workshop to ask how*

lessons learned can be applied to enforcement.

- *Another meeting - different format. Use modified American Assembly method.*
- *The website is great.*
- *To inform me/us of any changes or suggestions that are made.*
- *Summary from NOAA on lessons learned and next steps.*
- *Keep the state law enforcement and state fishery leadership fully involved.*
- *Follow up posting of materials was good.*

Please tell us how this meeting/workshop could have been more effective? (Q6)

- *More time to develop recommendations.*
- *It was a little short. Perhaps a two day meeting would be better.*
- *Larger room for breakouts.*
- *If NOAA were committed to change perhaps it wouldn't take Congressional action but as it stands and with the actions so far no other course seems possible.*
- *More numbers from industry and fewer from the FNGO's. Since when did the FNGO's get the biggest sit at the table?*
- *If there had been some more concert outcomes or steps forward. There was a lot of discussion that seemed helpful, but no real promise of results.*
- *It was excellent.*
- *Some NOAA speakers took too long in their presentations. Generally tables (breakouts) very well populated. However some were weak. Industry reps tended to be very parochial - e.g. every issue was in context of their clients/friends who received violations - same incident for most topics. This suggested they were not there for the good of the system or NOAA, as much for their own narrow self interest. Not sure how you screen that out other than getting references.*
- *The facilitator of the breakout group kept the group focused and tried to adhere to the time constraints. However, in summarizing comments the comments were diluted/filtered and did not convey the full import of the comments. Also, more time for the breakouts should have been provided.*
- *More NOAA field agents, more fishermen and their representatives, less bureaucrats.*
- *Workshop did well at inventorying problems but less well at exploring proposed solutions.*

- *More face time with policy-makers. No special reports like the UofMd.*
- *Less small group/breakout time. Too much emphasis on the average attendee, rather than on those with the most to add.*
- *Maybe a two day meeting may have helped.*
- *Dr. Lubchenko should have stayed for the entire day to see and hear firsthand what people had to say. More information should have/could have been provided as handouts to participants but management decisions and politics got in the way.*
- *Thought the meeting was well organized and accomplished key objectives. Absent more concrete objectives it is difficult to see what more could be accomplished.*
- *It was probably as effective as it could be given the short amount of time for the meeting and the cramped space where it was held.*
- *Format at round tables was not good. Recommend workshops leading to plenary session, multi-day.*

Additional comments:

- *Bottom line: Many attendees have reported to me they got a lot out of this. Kudos for NOAA taking the time to do it.*
- *Thank you. You folks did a nice job organizing this summit. Good lead facilitator.*

If you have questions about this evaluation report or the U.S. Institute's evaluation program please contact:

Bridget Radcliff, *Coordinator for ECR Support Programs*

U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

130 South Scott Avenue, Tucson, Arizona 85701

Telephone: 520.901.8572 Fax: 520.901.8573

Email: radcliff@ecr.gov Website: www.ecr.gov