



# NAWMP Revision: **Progress** & Prospects





## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** **MIKE ANDERSON**, JOHN EADIE, JEFF HERBERT, MIN HUANG, DALE HUMBURG, **FRED JOHNSON**, **MARK KONEFF**, JIM LEAFLOOR, **SETH MOTT**, THOMAS NUDDS, **ERIC REED**, JIM RINGELMAN, **MICHAEL RUNGE**, BARRY WILSON

**FROM:** DAVID A. SMITH- NAWMP COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR  
FOR  
STEVE WENDT - NAWMP COMMITTEE Co-CHAIR  
DON CHILDRESS - IAFWA AHM TASK FORCE



**SUBJECT:** APPOINTING A JOINT TASK GROUP (JTG) FOR CLARIFYING NAWMP POPULATION OBJECTIVES AND THEIR USE IN HARVEST MANAGEMENT

**DATE:** JUNE 14 2005

Your participation in an *ad hoc* group of waterfowl scientists is requested to advance Recommendation A of AHM Task Force Status Report #5, (the establishment of a technical group to explore useful ways in which to interpret NAWMP goals for both habitat and harvest management). This Joint Task Group (JTG) is being asked to further develop and discuss options for the future use of waterfowl population objectives in both harvest and habitat management activities. Initial ideas along these lines were first put forth by some members of the proposed JTG in a draft manuscript entitled *Reuniting Waterfowl Management*, and have been subsequently discussed by both the AHM Task Force and NAWMP Committee. ....



# Joint Task Group Recommendations (March 2007)

1. Harvest managers should adopt a shoulder strategy for Northern Pintails and Mid-Continent Mallards.
2. NAWMP should adopt the same shoulder strategy to ensure coherence.
3. Enhance the technical capacity of the AHMWG and the NSST.
4. Focus more science on reducing key uncertainties.
5. Convene a human dimensions working group to assess stakeholder values and develop an approach for more explicitly incorporating HD information into management decisions.
6. Convene a waterfowl management policy summit:  
"Future of Waterfowl Management Workshop"



# Messages from Minneapolis Policy Workshop (August 2008)

## Achieved Low Success in:

1. Goals for harvest and habitat management that are complementary and coherent.
2. Understanding and incorporating hunter expectations and satisfaction.
3. Simplifying waterfowl regulations.
4. Clear process for setting and revising population goals.
5. Rallying support of non-hunters.



# Messages from Minneapolis Policy Workshop (August 2008)

## Conclusions:

- ✓ A group or venue be created to continue the work of the Human Dimensions Working Group. (94% agreed or strongly agreed).
- ✓ The NAWMP update should be used to develop more coherent goals for waterfowl harvest and habitat management. (88% agreed or strongly agreed).



# Getting Started

The PC appointed a NAWMP Revision Steering Committee (Feb 2009):

- Broad-based; focal point for gathering, vetting and synthesizing ideas about content.
- Identify technical work and resources needed.
- Review NAWMP Assessment report and highlight topics needing attention.
- Develop stakeholder engagement process.
- Propose a review of management processes and institutions in light of the Revision.
- Propose work plan, schedule, process, etc.



## 2010 Progress to Date

1. Revision Steering Committee met in April to elaborate charge; numerous conference calls.
2. Technical working group established and met at Patuxent in June to consider a process for re-formulating Plan objectives.
3. RSC published the NAWMP Revision Scoping Document in early August.
4. PC met in August, reviewed draft Scoping document and agreed with recommendation that a series of objective identification workshops should be conducted as part of the initial consultation process.



# Messages from PC Meeting (Aug 2009)

## Draft Purpose Statement:

*The purpose of the NAWMP is to sustain abundant waterfowl populations while preserving the traditions of wildfowling and achieving broad benefits to biodiversity, ecosystem processes and the people of North America. Plan goals will be accomplished by partnerships that conserve habitats and sustain populations, guided by sound science.*

*A Vision for Integrated Waterfowl Management*





## 2010 Progress to Date

5. The Technical Work Group met on November 9-10 to finalize workshop format and a recommended consultation process.
6. Plan Committee meeting/workshop November 11-12. Approved 2-phase consultation process.
7. NAWMP workshops held in Portland, Memphis, Edmonton, Ottawa and (now) Sacramento.
8. Other input being received from flyways, DU, and [NAWMPrevision.org](http://NAWMPrevision.org) website.



# Purpose of Workshops

- Identify fundamental and means objectives for waterfowl management.
- Discuss alternative, broad-scale (high level) strategies for achieving objectives.
- Identify actions and measurable attributes associated with objectives
- Create ownership of objectives.
- Consistent process; diversity of attendees.



Primary participants = waterfowl management community (involved in managing populations, habitat, and hunting)

- Plan Committee, Revision Steering Committee
- NAWMP Science Support Team (NSST)
- AHM working group
- HD working group
- NAWC Councils and Staff
- Federal, state, provincial governments
- Joint Ventures (Habitat & Species)
- Flyway Councils and Technical Committees
- NGOs - DU, CA Waterfowl, Delta, WMI, others
- Minneapolis Meeting participants
- Sporting conservation council



## How will the results be used?

The Revision Steering Committee will be responsible for synthesizing workshop results, drawing on technical resources as needed.

- Synthesis work begins April 20-22.
- Proposed objectives hierarchy.
- Technical group - initial prototype model and decision framework.
- Vetted with NAWMP Committee.



# Consultation Process Round 2

- Communicate results back to waterfowl management community.
- Facilitated, face-to-face workshops: review objectives, actions, measurable attributes, consequence tables, and trade-offs.
- Use consultation results to further inform objectives hierarchy, decision framework, and modeling protocols proposed in draft NAWMP revision.



# Key Points on the Timeline

- March 22, 2010 - Final round 1 workshop(s) in Milwaukee at NAWNRC.
- April 20-23, 2010 - Revision Steering Committee begins work to synthesize results, develop prototype models.
- September, 2010 - Begin round 2 consultations at AFWA annual meeting.
- January, 2011 - Begin drafting NAWMP Revision document.
- June, 2011 - First draft released for comment.
- January, 2012 - Final draft for PC approval.



# So what's the problem?

## Draft Purpose Statement:

*The purpose of the Plan is to maintain abundant waterfowl populations, preserving the traditions of wildfowling and providing broad benefits to biodiversity, ecosystems, processes and the people of North America. Plan goals will be accomplished by partnering to conserve habitats and sustain populations, guided by sound science.*

**Not A Problem Statement!**



# A clearly articulated problem...

...considers the critical elements of the decision context. These include:

- The trigger or the underlying motivation
- The nature of the problem
  - Legal and regulatory mandates or socio-political context
  - Timing and frequency of the decision(s)
  - Scope and spatial extent of the decision(s)
- The decision makers; linkages to other decisions

"The Future of Waterfowl Management Workshop"

- August 26-28, 2008; Minneapolis, MN
- 192 attendees; cross-section of management community





# Of 188 workshop pre-registrants contacted, 162 (86%) completed a pre-workshop survey

What is your primary employment affiliation?	Federal agency	47	30%
	Non-Government Organization	30	19%
	Private business	3	2%
	State/Provincial agency	74	47%
	University	4	3%
How long have you been active in waterfowl management?	0-1 year	5	3%
	2-5 years	18	11%
	6-10 years	26	16%
	11-20 years	41	25%
	21-30 years	49	30%
	More than 30 years	22	14%
Many of us wear many hats--but which ONE hat do you most frequently find yourself wearing when it comes to waterfowl management--the hat which reads...	Agency Director/Executive Director	28	18%
	Administrator/Coordinator of a program	71	44%
	Biologist/Scientist	50	31%
	Researcher/Academic	5	3%
	Regulations Committee Member	6	4%
Country:	Canada	22	14%
	Mexico	0	0%
	United States	137	86%
You are:	Female	11	7%
	Male	149	93%
You are:	24 or under	0	0%
	25-44	38	24%
	45-64	122	76%
	65 or over	0	0%



**a. Resources dedicated to waterfowl habitat conservation should be re-allocated among important waterfowl landscapes**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	44	27.2	<b>67.3%</b>	29.3
	Somewhat agree	57	35.2	58.0	67.3
	Neutral	29	17.9	19.3	86.7
	Somewhat disagree	16	9.9	<b>13.4%</b>	97.3
	Strongly disagree	4	2.5	2.7	100.0
	Total	150	92.6	100.0	
Missing	Don't know	9	5.6		
	System	3	1.9		
	Total	12	7.4		
Total		162	100.0		

**Resources dedicated to conservation are not optimally allocated among landscapes**



**b. An inordinate amount of time is spent on the annual regulations setting process**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	45	27.8	<b>71.1%</b>	29.6
	Somewhat agree	63	38.9		71.1
	Neutral	26	16.0	17.1	88.2
	Somewhat disagree	16	9.9	<b>11.8%</b>	98.7
	Strongly disagree	2	1.2		100.0
	Total	152	93.8	100.0	
Missing	Don't know	8	4.9		
	System	2	1.2		
	Total	10	6.2		
Total		162	100.0		

**Too much time is spent setting annual regulations**



**c. Greater attention should be placed on monitoring and evaluation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	46	28.4	<b>77.5%</b>	28.8
	Somewhat agree	78	48.1		77.5
	Neutral	24	14.8	15.0	92.5
	Somewhat disagree	12	7.4	<b>7.5%</b>	100.0
	Total	160	98.8		100.0
Missing	System	2	1.2		
Total		162	100.0		

**Monitoring and evaluation needs to be enhanced**



**d. Attention to waterfowl and wetlands protection and management has declined at the federal level**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	43	26.5	<b>72.2%</b>	27.2
	Somewhat agree	71	43.8		72.2
	Neutral	22	13.6	13.9	86.1
	Somewhat disagree	15	9.3	<b>13.9%</b>	95.6
	Strongly disagree	7	4.3		100.0
	Total	158	97.5	100.0	
Missing	Don't know	1	.6		
	System	3	1.9		
	Total	4	2.5		
Total		162	100.0		

**Federal activities to conserve waterfowl and their habitats have declined**



**e. Attention to waterfowl and wetlands protection and management has declined at the state/province level**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	26	16.0	<b>61.8%</b>	16.6
	Somewhat agree	71	43.8		61.8
	Neutral	18	11.1	11.5	73.2
	Somewhat disagree	34	21.0	<b>26.8%</b>	94.9
	Strongly disagree	8	4.9		100.0
	Total	157	96.9	100.0	
Missing	Don't know	3	1.9		
	System	2	1.2		
	Total	5	3.1		
Total		162	100.0		

**State and provincial activities to conserve waterfowl and their habitats have declined**



**b. Too little attention has been placed on understanding waterfowl hunters and their satisfaction**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	27	16.7	<b>54.5%</b>	17.5
	Somewhat agree	57	35.2		54.5
	Neutral	30	18.5	19.5	74.0
	Somewhat disagree	32	19.8	<b>26.0%</b>	94.8
	Strongly disagree	8	4.9		100.0
	Total	154	95.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't know	4	2.5		
	System	4	2.5		
	Total	8	4.9		
Total		162	100.0		

**Too few resources are directed towards understanding waterfowl hunters**



**a. Attention to monitoring and evaluation and the science supporting waterfowl and wetlands management has declined among universities**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	42	25.9	<b>75.9%</b>	31.6
	Somewhat agree	59	36.4		75.9
	Neutral	18	11.1	13.5	89.5
	Somewhat disagree	11	6.8	<b>10.6%</b>	97.7
	Strongly disagree	3	1.9		100.0
	Total	133	82.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't know	27	16.7		
	System	2	1.2		
	Total	29	17.9		
Total		162	100.0		

**Universities are less attentive to waterfowl science and monitoring/evaluating**





**b. Attention to monitoring and evaluation and the science supporting waterfowl and wetlands management has declined at the federal level**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	32	19.8	<b>59.0%</b>	20.5
	Somewhat agree	60	37.0		59.0
	Neutral	27	16.7	17.3	76.3
	Somewhat disagree	28	17.3	<b>23.7%</b>	94.2
	Strongly disagree	9	5.6		100.0
	Total	156	96.3	100.0	
Missing	Don't know	4	2.5		
	System	2	1.2		
	Total	6	3.7		
Total		162	100.0		

**Federal agencies are less attentive to waterfowl science and monitoring/evaluating**



# What do these have in common?

- Resources dedicated to conservation are not optimally allocated among landscapes.
- Too much time is spent setting annual reports.
- Monitoring and evaluation needs to be improved.
- Federal activities to conserve waterfowl and their habitats have declined.
- State and provincial agencies have reduced efforts to conserve waterfowl and their habitats have declined.
- Too few resources are directed towards understanding waterfowl hunters.
- Universities are less attentive to waterfowl science and monitoring/evaluating.
- Federal agencies are less attentive to waterfowl science and monitoring/evaluating.

**Resource allocation?**



# Efficiently allocating resources is going to require...

- Agreement on our fundamental objectives.
- A more thoughtful plan for how we will go about achieving those objectives.
- Perhaps, updating our system of waterfowl management so we are better coordinated and working towards a common goal.

## Draft problem statement:

"The waterfowl management community is not in consensus on the fundamental objectives of waterfowl management, the means to achieve those objectives, nor the framework necessary for integrating multiple decisions in a way that efficiently allocates resources and coordinates actions."