

---

# THE MICRONESIA CHIEF EXECUTIVES' SUMMIT (MCES)

## REVIEW AND PLAN, 2011

---

### CONTENTS

---

---

|                                                                             |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Introduction .....</b>                                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>The Committees .....</b>                                                 | <b>5</b>  |
| The Mission of the Committees .....                                         | 5         |
| Activities and Accomplishments .....                                        | 6         |
| 1. The Micronesian Challenge .....                                          | 6         |
| 2. The Pacific Island Resource Recovery Initiative Committee (PIRRIC) ..... | 7         |
| 3. The Regional Invasive Species Council (RISC) .....                       | 8         |
| 4. The Communications Committee .....                                       | 9         |
| 5. The Tourism Committee .....                                              | 9         |
| 6. The Regional Workforce Development Council .....                         | 11        |
| 7. The Health Committee .....                                               | 11        |
| Perceptions of the MCES and the MCSF .....                                  | 12        |
| 1. Committee Strengths and Weaknesses .....                                 | 12        |
| 2. Committee Successes and Failures .....                                   | 13        |
| <b>MCES Overview .....</b>                                                  | <b>15</b> |
| 1. Leadership Expectations .....                                            | 15        |
| 2. Fundraising .....                                                        | 17        |
| 3. Capacity Building .....                                                  | 18        |
| 4. Administrative Assistance to the MCES .....                              | 19        |
| <b>Internal and External Strengths and Challenges .....</b>                 | <b>21</b> |
| Internal Strengths and Challenges .....                                     | 22        |

|                                             |           |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Strengths .....                          | 22        |
| 2. Challenges .....                         | 23        |
| External Opportunities and Challenges ..... | 24        |
| 3. Opportunities .....                      | 24        |
| 4. External Challenges .....                | 25        |
| <b>Action Plan .....</b>                    | <b>26</b> |
| Task Items, Budget and Timing .....         | 31        |

## INTRODUCTION

---

---

The Micronesia Chief Executives' Summit (MCES) has spawned the development of a robust and active array of committees creating a wide variety of programs and public interest initiatives. From workforce development to environmental preservation, the efforts of the committees generate a substantial portion of the outcomes intended by the MCES to improve the quality of life for residents of the Freely Associated States and the U.S. flag territories. Consequently, a component of the U.S. Department of Interior (DOI) grant being administered by the Graduate School, to facilitate the development the Micronesia Center for a Sustainable Future (MCSF), is to review the activities and accomplishments of the committees. The purpose is to understand how the MCES can support and sustain the work of the committees. To do so, consultants to the Graduate School were contracted to provide professional services to conduct a survey and summary review of ongoing committee activities and accomplishments. The specific objectives of the project are:

- To survey each of the committees to identify their activities and accomplishments and collect electronic information suitable to be shared over a website to be developed for the MCSF;
- To conduct a needs assessment for each of the committees to identify ways in which the MCSF can support and enhance the mission and initiatives of each of the committees; and
- To develop a summary action plan, in sufficient detail, to allow the Chief Executives and/or their designated representatives to prioritize MCSF support for committee requirements for staffing, technical assistance and funding.

The survey and planning activities were conducted over a two month period and engaged the leadership of the following committees through a non-directed interview process:

- The Micronesian Challenge (MC)
- The Pacific Island Resource Recovery Initiative Committee (PIRRIC)
- The Regional Invasive Species Council (RISC)
- The Communications Committee
- The Tourism Committee
- The Regional Workforce Development Council (RWDC)
- The Health Committee (HC)

Some of the interviews, specifically with the Health Committee, the Micronesian Challenge, the Regional Invasive Species Council, and the Telecommunications Committee were conducted at the proceedings of the 14th MCES in Palau. The other committee interviews were conducted via telephone from Guam and Hawaii. In all instances, the Chairman, Vice-Chairman or a combination of committee leaders were interviewed. Generally, the interviews lasted about an hour and offered an opportunity to discuss, in depth, committee plans and the ways in which the MCSF could support their efforts. The results provide an accurate representation of the views and opinions of all those interviewed. The discussion guide and summaries of the interviews as well as an identification of the committee members that were interviewed are attached. Note also that interviews were not successfully conducted with the Transportation and Energy Committees. Interview will therefore be undertaken at the next Summit in Pohnpei.

## THE COMMITTEES

---

---

### THE MISSION OF THE COMMITTEES

---

The committees were of two general types - they were either formed by the MCES at the request of specific member entities or they represented already functioning regional organizations that were invited by the MCES to participate in the Summit process and articulate their critical regional function, subject area or interest. For example, the Regional Workforce Development Council, the Regional Invasive Species Committee, the Pacific Regional Resource Recycling Initiative Committee, the Energy Committee, the Transportation Committee and the Telecommunications Committee were formed through the MCES process and the policy interests of the Chief Executives. In the case of other committees, such as the Micronesian Challenge, the Health Committee, and the Tourism Committee, there were programs and projects already underway and these committees were requested by the MCES to pursue their initiatives in conjunction with the MCES. These committees were eager to do so in order to gain endorsement for their plans and programs by the Chief Executives.

All of the committees, with the exception of the Telecommunications Committee, are committed to regional cooperation and appreciate the need for regionalism. At the same time, a strong sensitivity is evident for the unique qualities and differences of each jurisdiction. In all of the committees, committee actions are approved on a consensus basis. Uniformly, the committees felt the need for regionalism and understood that collectively, the islands of the United States Affiliated Pacific Islands (USAPI) share similar challenges in environmental and cultural preservation as well as economic development. Thus, collaboration and cooperation is viewed as useful in seeking solutions to common problems. In addition, it was recognized that the economies of scale created by regional strategies not only afford cost efficiencies but also a more comprehensive and effective response capacity to many of the issues the islands share. It also increases the attractiveness of funding proposals to international and U.S. sources, and works to garner greater visibility among U.S. and International interests.

It was also clear that all of the committees were dedicated to consistent and coordinated program development and execution across the USAPI region. All of the islands, regardless of their size or stage of development, are considered equal partners. The strength of the committees depends equally on the strength of each of their members. An “all for one and one for all” approach to issues and initiatives is universally shared. In all, the most frequently mentioned success of each committee was its ability to foster and sustain dialogue and cooperation between its members. At the time it was repeatedly mentioned that committees were unaware what other committees were engaged in and that cross-committee communication was too infrequent. Committees indicated that they are pursuing their individual regional plans independent of the other committees and with little guidance from the Chief Executives.

MCES is viewed by the committees as sort of a “court of approval.” Initiatives and policy objectives appear to percolate more from the bottom up and less from the top down. This fact creates among some of the committees the impression that there exists a certain level of competition for attention between the committees. It also obfuscates a clear overall regional framework or strategy within which the work of all the committees can be viewed as coordinated and complementary. None-the-less, the work being done by the committees is voluminous and committee members are clearly passionate about the need for regional policy and program development.

---

## ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

---

---

### ***1. THE MICRONESIAN CHALLENGE***

---

The Micronesian Challenge (MC) Committee was born during the Eighth Conference of the Parties of the United Nations (UN) Convention on Biodiversity (COP8). At this world-wide meeting of environmental leaders, representatives from the MCES jurisdictions presented a commitment to “effectively conserve at least 30% of the near-shore marine and 20% of the terrestrial resources across Micronesia by 2020”.

The commitment was signed by the Chief Executives of the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Territory of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and a fundraising effort was initiated to implement the commitment. The project has gained significant international recognition and has stimulated the creation of similar projects in other parts of the world. The committee is currently involved in building the capacity of the Micronesian Challenge (MC) and strengthening the commitment of the MCES members to sustainable development. To do so, their highest priority is the development a comprehensive strategic plan to facilitate the expansion of the breadth and scope of the committee’s work. The plan seeks to build capacity to increase the number and quality of protected marine and terrestrial preserves in the region. It also seeks to establish a truly regional perspective to resource conservation and to expand the impact of the MC from a network of unrelated protected areas to a uniform system of protected areas with management policies and procedures that spans the entire region. This integration will assist in securing long-term commitments to the sustainable development goals of the MC.

The MC believes that its major contribution thus far to the region has been to establish a truly regional perspective and to impact the implementation of conservation programs throughout the islands. The MC has successfully developed an effective network among its members, associates and regional and international partners and has productively demonstrated how to share expertise and program information on a regional, as well as on an international basis. Its members believe it is a model committee and provides an example to other committees as they build their own regional programs.

The greatest challenge that the MC faces is maintaining the required level of communication between national, state and community-based stakeholders to implement policies and programs. In addition,

fund raising is a constant concern. The MC is currently working to establish endowments in each member jurisdiction to enhance work to establish and monitor protected area networks. However, identifying funding for the needed staff and facilities has been extremely difficult. Also, Guam and the CNMI have had to delay their mandated financial contribution to the program because of the financial condition of both governments.

In addition to the organizational capacity issues facing the Challenge, it has also faced difficulty in establishing and maintaining necessary levels of scientific integrity to allow for measures of conservation which are required by granting agencies. The lack of agreed upon standards for scientific measures of outcomes makes it difficult to document and verify the impact of the various MC projects in the region. That also frustrates efforts to monitor consistent progress. Also, the MC faces issues of continuity when elections result in changes of administration.

---

## ***2. THE PACIFIC ISLAND RESOURCE RECOVERY INITIATIVE COMMITTEE (PIRRIC)***

---

The PIRRIC was created as a response to efforts by individual islands to collect and dispose of scrap metals, as well as other waste materials. By working cooperatively, and by focusing on economies of scale, the Committee has initiated a regional approach to metal recycling. However, performance of the Committee has varied due to extreme changes in the international market price of metal waste. From that initial effort, the mission of the organization has been to pursue dialogue and cooperation between all of the islands and to seek cooperative solutions to solid waste recycling.

The committee is currently pursuing the development of a solid waste stream analysis as well as an electronic portal to share information and ideas about solid waste management throughout the USAPI. PIRRIC has organized itself into a 501 (3) (c) corporation and is now in the process of developing its own strategic plan. The plan will provide, through a central organization, the ability to coordinate collection and recycling efforts regionally. The PIRRICs most important contribution thus far has been to create a regional perspective for solid waste management and to bring the various stakeholders in the industry and the government together to discuss potential solutions.

The challenges that the PIRRIC faces are considerable. The distance of the region from primary markets makes it more difficult to provide competitive pricing for recyclables. In addition, the wide variation of global prices for metals and other waste commodities has made it difficult to create a consistent response to regional solid waste management needs and responses. Early successes in working towards regional responses and taking advantage of economies of scale were wiped away by high metal prices. With these high prices, the presumption that there existed a need for a regional approach to solid waste management and disposal flew out the window. However, with the collapse of this price bubble, the original focus on cooperation, partnership and of economies of scale have returned. In addition, it has been difficult to identify and maintain a regional broker for recyclables. Finally, the

committee struggles with organizational capacity issues to measure solid waste streams and the lack of resources and equipment to provide a consistent supply of regionally collected recyclables.

---

### ***3. THE REGIONAL INVASIVE SPECIES COUNCIL (RISC)***

---

The RISC was one of the first committees formed in 2005 by the precursor to the MCES, the Western Micronesia Chief Executives' Summit (WMCES). The mission of the committee was to share information and ideas to prevent the spread of invasive species from outside jurisdictions and between Micronesian jurisdictions. In the last year the RISC has been awarded funding by the U.S. military to develop a regional invasive species prevention program, called the Micronesian Bio Security Plan. The plan is comprehensive and deals with every form of life that could pose a threat to the Micronesian ecosystem, from single celled organisms to plants and animals. The issue of invasive species has bridged the issues of Biodiversity and Climate Change and the plan is currently being heralded as a world class program that has garnered significant international attention.

The primary accomplishment of the committee was to obtain the support of the Chief Executives to convince the U.S. military to address the issue of invasive species on a regional scale. The program is unprecedented in the scope of the plan and the geographic area that it covers.

The primary challenge facing the RISC is a lack of consistent funding at the jurisdictional level. Because of the failure to sufficiently support invasive species activities, the committee has, for all practical purposes, disbanded. By default, many of the responsibilities that were being jointly handled by the RISC and have recently been managed by the Department of Interior, including the management of the ongoing research program for the Micronesian Bio Security Plan. In addition, and partly due to funding difficulties, many of the professionals originally involved and responsible for the inception of the program from the various jurisdictions have left through attrition since 2005. Unfortunately, the governments of the region have not provided the continuing funding necessary to replace those individuals. Currently, one of the most coveted programs of the MCES, and a program that has been a great success internationally, is operating entirely through support, both financially and administratively, from the U.S. Federal government. The RISC is therefore in need of technical assistance and managerial experience to reestablish a sustainable organizational capacity to finally design and execute the Micronesian bio-security plan.

---

### ***4. THE COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE***

---

The Communications Committee was established in 2006 by the WMCES and has continued to function as part of the MCES. During this period in time, it was hoped that a regional approach to the development of telecommunications infrastructure could be achieved. Unfortunately, Guam and the CNMI did not believe that regional cooperation had much value given the differences in telecommunications regulations, current development stages and the lack of a market for Guam based

carriers in the FSM. The Committee, at the recent 14th Summit, therefore switched its allegiance from the MCES to the Micronesian Presidents Summit (MPS). This organization was created simultaneously with the WMCES in order to address the unique issues of the three Freely Associated States (Palau, the FSM and the RMI). Committee programs are further frustrated by the different stages of technological advancement in the area of telecommunications. Palau has insufficient bandwidth due to the lack of a submarine fiber optic cable but has a rather strong internal telecommunications infrastructure. In contrast, the FSM and the RMI have varying levels of submarine fiber optic cable access but lack internal infrastructure to adequately link many of their numerous and far flung islands. In actuality, while professional cooperation exists, there is no unified regional telecommunications strategy. In addition, the committee leadership is confused as to whether it really is part of the MCES or not and views its primary allegiance to be with the MPS. Clearly, if a regional strategy is to be pursued in the area of telecommunications, it will have to be directed by the Chief Executives.

---

## ***5. THE TOURISM COMMITTEE***

---

During the 7th Western Micronesian Chief Executives' Summit, the Tourism Committee was created and assigned by the MCES to serve as a complementary vehicle with the Pacific Asia Travel Association (PATA) for regional marketing initiatives, and to collectively provide tourism updates and advise the MCES on tourism related issues within the region.

The PATA Micronesia Chapter advises the Committee on various regional and sub-regional initiatives and goals that have been discussed and approved by the Association. These goals are then presented to the MCES, through the Committee, to gain the support of the Summit to assist in pushing these initiatives forward.

The Committee's mission is to create greater global awareness of the region's diverse attractions and a unique brand identity as well as to create business opportunities and income. This is ultimately intended to expand the tax base to fund public services, improve quality of life and create employment opportunities for island residents.

The Committee has four distinct projects it is currently working on:

### **1. Creation of the Micronesian Cruise Association (MCA)**

The MCA is a non-profit, non-stock, corporation composed of public and private sector members who are interested in developing the region's cruise industry. The MCA's mandate is to foster an understanding of the cruise industry and its operating practices. The MCA seeks to build cooperative relationships with its partner cruise lines.

### **2. Visitor Arrival Information**

The Micronesian PATA Chapter continues to struggle with updated visitor arrival statistics. Currently the Chapter collects updated information and posts on the Micronesia website funded by the Chapter at [www.magnificentmicronesia.com](http://www.magnificentmicronesia.com). The Federated States of Micronesia is in need of assistance in collecting updated and current visitor arrival information from the islands for planning and research purposes.

### **3. Micronesia Branding Initiative:**

As part of the committee's effort to market the region, it is in the process of establishing a branding program for the region to establish relevance and awareness for the region as a destination.

### **4. Regional Promotions Activities**

The committee also is committed to promoting the region at various travel fairs and events throughout the Asia Pacific region as a means of increasing visitor arrivals.

The Tourism Committee is focused, well organized and has the guidance and leadership of PATA and the Micronesia PATA Chapter to assist in the execution of promotional activities. It appears to be relatively effective as a catalyst to spark private initiative in the development of regional tourism projects. At the same time, it has established itself as a supra tourism promotional entity for the USAPI in the Western Pacific. The committee does not feel it has the internal organizational capacity, communications infrastructure or financial resources to adequately support such a comprehensive approach to industrial development but is hoping that the MCES will recognize the importance of their efforts and provide the necessary support. In addition, the ability of these small island states to afford the level of promotional spending required to be competitive is, to date, severely limited. It is probably the most advanced committee in terms of managerial expertise, focus and capability.

---

## ***6. THE REGIONAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL***

---

The Regional Workforce Development Council (RWDC) was officially formed at the 8th MCES. The mission of the Council was to extend Workforce Innovation in Regional Economic Development (WIRED), a program of the U.S. Department of Labor, into the regional as an effective approach to workforce development. Because of Guam's experience with WIRED, the Director of the Guam Department of Labor was identified as the Secretariat of the RWDC. The RWDC then developed a Five-Year Strategic Plan, which was adopted by the Chief Executives at the 9th MCES.

The mission of the RWDC is to improve the quality of life for workers in the region through the pursuit of the '*power of e3*', a U.S. Employment and Training Act program developed to coordinate the needs of labor, educational systems, economic development and the employment community. Much of the work of the RWDC has been to assist its members to create programs that are both aligned with the five-year

strategic plan and to meet the general programmatic guidelines of matching private sector workforce needs with the development of training and economic development programs.

The RWDC has successfully created a cooperative approach to developing and demonstrating a regional commitment to workforce development. This cooperation is evidenced by the creation of a clearly articulated regional plan and consistent reporting and the participation of each of the council members in the implementation of that plan. The consistent participation of the members at regional meetings and the progress they are making in their jurisdictions is offered as evidence of their success. The problem is that progress is not uniform. The challenge stems from the fact that Employment Training Act programs only extend to Guam, the CNMI and Palau. This lack of continuity between the FSM and RMI entities and the rest of the member entities of the MCES makes it difficult to assess if any consistent approach. Given that the FSM and the RMI have the highest unemployment rates, the lowest metrics in workforce aptitude and the largest population bases, the gap in capacity is the biggest challenge facing the Council.

---

## ***7. THE HEALTH COMMITTEE***

---

The MCES initiated the Health Committee during 2nd WMCES. At first the focus of the Committee was unclear. Many of the committee members were also members of Pacific Islands Health Officer's Association (PIHOA). PIHOA is a regional medical organization established in 1995 and the members of the Health Committee determined that to establish planning continuity, PIHOA should become the Secretariat for the Health Committee. The mission of the Health Committee is to create a unified voice on health issues for the region and to encourage effective strategic planning, unifying all of the various components of the health sector, and elevating the importance of health as a regional development objective. The hope is that the Health Committee can accelerate initiatives that the health sector believe important because of its access to the MCES. A key example is the epidemic declaration by the MCES with regard to non-communicable diseases (NCD). Because the Health Committee has a recognized political mandate, it was able to secure a regional epidemic declaration by the MCES and then secure support for the declaration from the Association of Pacific Island Legislators (APIL). This is useful to raising resources for health related issues. An initiative such as this requires that a broad array of specific issues be addressed simultaneously. Key to such an effort includes human resource development, training, service specialization, and applying the expertise of specialists, where needed.

The NCD initiative is currently the most important initiative, among many, that the Health committee is involved with. It is viewed as an example of how the MCES can assist with both vertical influences, by endorsing a program from the Health Committee but also provide horizontal influence by assisting other committees of the MCES such as workforce development, environmental interests, and economic development agencies to work together to address a regional societal behavioral issue.

The Health Committee has done an excellent job in establishing coordination of public health interests in the region. A spirit and environment of collaboration and mutual assistance has been established. It is recognized and appreciated that smaller jurisdictions, such as Palau, sometimes have expertise in areas that larger jurisdictions, such as Guam, do not. The desire and willingness to share and benefit from the collective resources of the region is an example of a true appreciation of the importance of regional cooperation in addressing preventive healthcare, communicable diseases and non-communicable diseases.

What the Health Committee has not done well is establish the means or ability to collaborate more effectively with the other committees of the MCES or across sectors in the communities in which they serve. The most noticeable example is in the area of human resource development. Currently the Health Committee is involved in developing human resource development programs. However, this effort lacks involvement by the Regional Workforce Development Council. This is but one example of the perceived “siloed” nature of the MCES committee structure and the Health Committee believes that a sense of competition has been established between committees to gain the attention from the Chief Executives.

---

## PERCEPTIONS OF THE MCES AND THE MCSF

---

The perception of the Committees regarding the MCES and the MCSF was largely guided by its past experience as a committee in the MCES. In addition, each committee’s perceptions were impacted and guided by the committee’s performance since the inception of the MCES in 2003. In other words, while the committees were far less clear regarding the design and purpose of the MCSF, their recommendation regarding the MCSF were directly connected to their past successes and failures as a committee of the MCES and their perceived needs to achieve their committee goals.

---

### ***1. COMMITTEE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES***

---

Generally, Committees indicated that they had been adept at addressing their priorities in the regional context and making solid decisions regarding these priorities. They also stressed a like ability to cooperate and create strong partnerships with one another which assisted them in sharing information and ideas. With many committees, this has lead to the development of the basic structures for peer learning networks. All of these successes in partnering with one another, in the context of the MCES, have expanded the potential to improve national and regional capacity.

Along with these successes, the Committees also pointed out numerous areas that needed improvement, such as cross-sectoral, and cross-committee communication and cooperation. For example, the Micronesia Challenge Committee expressed a perceived lack of communication with other environmental-based committees such as PIRRIC and RISC and made it clear that they would like to see

improved interaction. Likewise, the Health Committee expressed the desire to improve their interface with the RWDC Committee.

In addition, committees expressed some disappointment at the failure to communicate better and more frequently during the course of the year and outside the context of the MCES bi-annual meeting structure. Because of this, there was a perceived lack of on-going mentoring.

Many committees placed part of the blame for this on their lack of consistent funding, which restricted interactive capacities, travel and administrative capability. This lack of funding also disallowed the development of long-term staff. In many committees this was due to a clear lack of organizational structure, which, once again, many attributed to a lack of funds to meet and better define structural needs.

Despite these weaknesses, certain committees still referred to strengths in developing missions and strategic plans, as well as successes in the development of corporate structures and information systems. For example, PIRRIC was able to develop a corporate structure and a web page, but had insufficient funding to update and continue funding the web page. Other committees, such as RWDC, indicated that management and information capabilities were more than adequate despite the lack of a corporate structure.

---

## ***2. COMMITTEE SUCCESSES AND FAILURES***

---

Within the context of these Committee observations of strengths and weaknesses, numerous Committees perceived a strong level of achievement in many different areas, such as:

- Sharing experiences;
- Leveraging other programs;
- Moving resources to communities;
- Spurring other initiatives around the world;
- Expanding fund-raising opportunities;
- Expanding capacity, nationally and in the region;
- Sharing ideas and experiences;
- Expanding employment opportunities;
- Development of regional cooperation; and

- Improvement in information sharing;

## MCES OVERVIEW

---

---

Across the board, the committees recognized the importance of the MCES in creating the opportunity for their committees to exist, to focus on their areas of interest and to interact and partner with jurisdictional colleagues.

---

### ***1. LEADERSHIP EXPECTATIONS***

---

While committees recognized the importance of the MCES in moving their agendas forward, they often had different perceptions as to their expectations of the Chief Executives in this regional process.

#### **a) Endorsement**

Almost all committees expressed a strong desire that the leadership provide endorsement of the work of the Committees and, through this endorsement, movement forward of work agendas and activities. One committee even indicated that it saw a major contribution of the MCES and the committee structure as a mechanism for changing the mindsets of leaders on important issues. Some committees, such as PIRRIC, expressed the desire for a loose structure that permitted committee activity and endorsement by the Chief Executives. Many committees perceived the current process to be a committee driven process, where the committees identify issues, recommend solutions and the Chief Executives endorse such recommendations.

#### **b) Guidance by Chief Executives**

A number of committees also expressed the need for guidance by the Chief Executives to identify priorities in the various areas of interest, as reflected by the committee structure. Some committees sought both endorsement by the Chief Executives as well as greater guidance in identifying priorities and direction. For example, the Health Committee indicated that a great benefit of the MCES process was the endorsement of the Chief Executives of health initiatives, which permitted the Committee and its secretariat, the Pacific Island Health Officers Association, to take the initiatives forward and improve success at the regional and international levels.

#### **c) Regional Vision**

Within the context of these two somewhat complementary perceptions of committee and leadership interaction, many committees expressed a desire for the Chief Executives to establish a regional vision and perspective. This is compatible with the perception that the Chief

Executives should identify regional priorities. As expressed by the Health Committee, many committee members interviewed saw the MCES as the horizontal body that sets broad agendas while seeing the committees as vertical in nature, dealing with specific issues.

**d) Better Communication**

This horizontal versus vertical perception of responsibility envisions better communications between jurisdictions and across committees through leadership direction. The committees frequently expressed the need to overcome the current vertical isolation of the committees and the issues that the committees represent.

**e) Regional Issues**

The committees generally saw the MCES process as a mechanism for identifying and addressing regional issues through committee interaction.

- *Technological Sensitivity*

Within this context, the committees expressed a need for both the committees and the leadership to be sensitive to the different stages of development of the jurisdiction. The Communications Committee expressed this most strongly, citing the very different levels of development in the telecommunications sector at both the structure level and at the technological level. While Guam and Saipan have privatized their telecommunication sectors, and Palau allows privatization, the FSM and the RMI maintain governmental monopolies. Technologically, Guam and Saipan have full submarine cable connectivity, Palau has only Satellite connectivity, while the FSM has mixed connectivity.

- *Complementary Programs*

The committees also expressed a desire that the activity of committees and leaders complement, not duplicate or override existing national, and to some extent, regional programs.

- *Committee Structure meeting Regional Needs*

Finally, the committees expressed a desire that the committee activities fulfill regional needs and that the committee structure reflect these needs, even if it requires the addition to or deletion of existing committees.

---

## ***2. FUNDRAISING***

---

Probably the most dynamic issue discussed in committee interviews related to fundraising. Generally, the issue had two components, fundraising for minor committee administrative activities and fundraising for program implementation at the national and regional levels.

**a) Committee Activities**

As indicated above, most committees do not feel that they have sufficient funding to fulfill the mandate of the MCES, which is to follow through on directives of the Chief Executives within the timeframe of bi-annual MCES meetings. However, other committees, such as Health and PIRRIC, do not seem to be as concerned regarding their long-term ability to fund such activities.

**b) Program Implementation**

The larger fundraising issue is in regard to long-term implementation of projects in committee and program areas. Most committees indicated that they felt that this was a critical need and responsibility of the MCES, and indirectly, of the MCSF, which will be discussed below.

**c) Identify and Access Funding Sources**

Within the context of program implementation, committees indicated that they believe that the MCES, through the efforts and endorsement of the Chief Executives, should identify and access grants and technical assistance from both the U.S. and other international sources. This would infer the need for a secretariat to the Chief Executives that could provide this identification and grant writing function in assistance to the Committees.

**d) Lobbying**

In addition to the endorsement and grant development functions of such a Secretariat, the committees generally indicated that they felt that one of the primary functions of the Chief Executives in the fund-raising process was the lobbying function that so often is critical in 'sealing the deal'. This is closely related to the 'endorsement' function, as it is often the final stage in committee efforts to identify and fund appropriate projects.

**e) Administrative Support for Committee Activities**

As indicated, Committees also stressed the need for the MCES to support their own fundraising activities. As in the case of leadership perceptions discussed above, the committees appear to desire both committee-directed efforts and MCES/Chief Executive directed efforts in regard to program development fund raising.

**f) Brand Identity**

In relation to the perception that the MCES should provide identify and access funding from various international sources, committees indicated the need to develop an MCES brand that had regional and international validity and that would qualitatively improve their ability to raise funds. This connects very closely with the perceived need to lobby with appropriate international agencies, countries and officials to expand the identification of the MCES as a legitimate conduit for outside development funding.

**g) Cross Committee Collaboration**

Closely related to concept of brand identity and lobbying of international sources is the perception of the committees that through the MCES, cross committee collaboration can be developed in accessing funding sources at a greater level than currently exists. For example, the Micronesia Challenge, PIRRIC and RISC have cross-cutting issues related to both Biodiversity and Climate Change that, if packaged, could improve funding amounts and opportunities.

---

***3. CAPACITY BUILDING***

---

Most committees stressed a certain lack of capacity to full the obligations placed upon them through the MCES process. With no direct funding sources, requirements for bi-annual meetings, the need for more frequent meetings, minimal organizational structures, often non-existent missions and strategic plans, and lack of sufficient staffing, the general consensus was that committees need capacity building assistance from the MCES, its leaders and its potential Secretariat.

**a) Guidance on Organizational Structures**

Many committees expressed a need for enhanced organizational structures with better defined missions, goals and objectives. Some committees only meet at the two MCES meetings every year and have minimal, if any, contact outside of these meetings. Their lack of ability to implement directives of the Chief Executives, and their resulting frustration is therefore understandable.

**b) Direct Funding of MCES Participation**

This frustration is made even greater taking into account the lack of funding available to attend the two bi-annual MCES meetings. Many committees therefore expressed a desire for direct funding of their participation of MCES meetings as an essential capacity building mechanism.

**c) Funding to Create and Convene Committees**

The committees expressed a related desire to have funding available to create and convene committees outside of the scope of the MCES bi-annual meeting structure. Most committees recognized a need for expanded communication and interaction, which is best accomplished within the context of working meetings, both in person and via internet and telephone.

**d) Improved Information Systems**

The committees also indicated that, short of adding additional meetings to respond to MCES directives and on-going activities, improved information systems were necessary. This was also put forth as another funding issue. For example, the PIRRIC Committee earlier created a web site but ran out of funds to keep it active. The web site was and is critical to the exchange of ideas and pilot project information necessary for improved performance in solid waste management across the region.

**e) Improved Technology and Technology Equality**

Similarly, certain committees stressed a need to improve their technology, as in the telecommunications sector. This is certainly a funding issue and goes beyond mere committee capacity. In order to achieve cooperative status among jurisdictions, some committees indicated that technology needed to be equalized in order for regional development growth and cooperation to be maximized.

**f) Equipment**

Likewise, some committees expressed a need to improve equipment capacity, both at the national and regional level. For example, PIRRIC expressed the need to purchase equipment that can be used on a regional basis and that is too expensive to afford on a national basis.

**g) External Capacity**

Finally, committees indicated a need for administrative assistance through external capacity, as through a secretariat, which capacity might include staffing, funding raising, grant writing, information technology and capacity, and the like, as further discussed below.

---

***4. ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE TO THE MCES***

---

THE MCSF – WHAT IS IT?

---

Many Committees had little idea of exactly what the MCSF was or what it is supposed to be. Among the responses regarding the intended function of the MCSF included:

- An entity that would provide staff support to the MCES;

- A Secretariat for the MCSF;
- A body that focused on providing capacity building to the committees and the jurisdictions;
- An organization intended to provide enhanced administrative capacity to the Committees and the MCES;
- An entity that would enhance fundraising of committees and the MCES;
- An entity focusing on facilitating the Vision of the Chief Executives by the MCES if their committees are to function at the level anticipated by the Chief Executives; and
- Administrative assistance to the MCES.

---

#### SUMMIT MANAGEMENT

Committees recognized the need to better manage the Summit process on a year around basis and to include better coordination between such management and committee activities before, during and after the summits. Areas that were perceived in need of improvement included:

- Better logistical coordination before, during and after the summit event;
- Improved pre-summit assistance to the hosting jurisdiction;
- Improved committee assistance during the entire year;
- Better post summit organization and follow-through to the next summit;
- Consistent central responsibility for the development of the communiqué and related documents;
- The insurance of continuity between summits; and
- Assistance with event coordination.

---

#### MCSF – WHAT SHOULD IT BE?

Within this context of an understanding of the need for better and more comprehensive Summit management, the committees also expressed a broad variety of recommendations as to what they would like to see the MCSF, in this administrative role, provide, including:

- Fundraising;
- Wraparound commonalities;

- Communication pathways;
- Education;
- Definition of values;
- Improve regionalism;
- Help define and pursue cross-cutting issues;
- Take the Chief Executives' vision forward;
- Provide technical assistance;
- Lobby; and
- Improve institutional mechanisms.

## **INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES**

To develop the action plan to support the activities of the committees, a top line review of the accomplishments and challenges of the committee was prepared using the information garnered from the interviews that were completed. Based upon this review, a series of initiatives will be recommended to the Graduate School, in the form of an action plan, to help enhance the programmatic outcomes that can be generated by the committees. The review considers the committees as part of the MCES, an organizational system that identifies regional issues and recommends and implements regional projects under the auspices of the MCES. However, currently, other than meetings regularly at MCES gatherings, the committees do not operate as a system but instead, pursue independent initiatives.

The lack of coordination between committees contributes to a perception that committees are duplicating efforts and are inefficiently utilizing regional resources. In addition, the separate and somewhat unequal status of the various committees in terms of organizational capacity and technical capabilities, as well as the lack of inter-committee communication limits their effectiveness for the MCES. For example, one of the greatest regional challenges of the Health Committee is to foster and develop human resources for health. Yet there is virtually no interaction between the RWDC and the Health Committee. In fact the RWDC has not identified human resources for health in its five-year strategic plan as a priority.

Likewise, one of the greatest challenges facing PIRRIC is the transportation of recyclable materials off-island, yet there is no interaction with the transportation committee; in fact the transportation committee is inactive. If information, objectives and resources were shared, both vertically to the

MCES and horizontally across and among all of the committees, then the committees would be more effective in generating positive outcomes for the region.

---

## INTERNAL STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES

---

---

### ***1. STRENGTHS***

---

Regional collaboration among committee members: All of the active committees meet regularly, and their members openly share information with those in their committee, and similarly collaborate to achieve committee objectives across the region.

- Participation of committee members

None of the committees believed that their members were not sufficiently motivated or engaged to achieve goals and objectives of their committees.

- Dedication to regionalism

All of the committees, with the exception of the Communications Committee, believe that regional policies and programs that include both the Freely Associated States (FAS) and the Flag Territories will enhance the interests of each of the states represented on the committees.

- Regional cooperation

The committees believe that the strength of the committee is dependent on the success of each of the jurisdictions represented. All jurisdictions are considered equally important, regardless of their size or political affiliation.

- Expertise

The committees have been successful in attracting highly qualified and capable participants. The committees are developing excellent programs and, through their work, have helped to enhance the reputation of the MCES world-wide.

- Commitment

The committees have been operating for several years and have long term views to accomplishing their missions and as such are stable and viable partners in the regional development process.

---

## ***2. CHALLENGES***

---

- Funding

The committees generally receive no organizational funding. For some, such as the RWDC, the participating jurisdictions have limited U.S. Federal funding or funding from NGOs to facilitate meetings and discussions of the committees but no lack of funding for the expansion of their organizational capacity. In the case of the Micronesian Challenge, grant funding has been obtained for specific programs, but no funding has been secured to expand the capabilities of the committee itself necessary to hire staff, or conduct program evaluation or fundraising.

- Communications

The cost and lack of internet bandwidth in the FAS, particularly in Palau and all of the states of the FSM except Pohnpei, frustrates communications. In addition, the region spans several time zones so maintaining communication and dialogue between members is difficult.

- Geographic dispersion

The vast distances between the various states represented by the committees makes face-to-face interaction very costly.

- Lack of Technical and Organizational Resources

Many committees lack the technical assistance resources to organize and implement programs effectively. They require assistance in strategic planning, fund raising and program evaluation services. For example, assistance is needed in determining viable metrics in evaluating the impact of conservation measures by the MC. Another example is that the Health Committee has members in need of technical assistance to evaluate risk factor data for non-communicable diseases. Other issues are more organizational in nature. The transportation and energy committees need assistance in organizing their members and establishing a consistent set of programs. In addition, most committees lack expertise in grant writing and fund raising.

- Lack of inter-committee communication

Committees do not collaborate and rarely communicate with each other. Although they share common issues and problems, they are unaware of the progress of other committees. Synergies between programs of the committees are not being realized and duplication of effort and a sense of competition between the committees exists. The perceived competition is for the attention of the MCES. The committees have requested a means of sharing information between themselves, utilizing, for example, a web based information portal.

- Lack of direction from the MCES

Committees are not sure what the vision of the Chiefs is with regard to regional development and as such they are not clear how to align their programmatic objectives to achieve the expectations of the Chiefs.

---

## EXTERNAL OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

---

### ***3. OPPORTUNITIES***

---

- Coordinating initiatives to improve program outcomes

By establishing a mechanism to coordinate initiatives and objectives of the committees, it would be possible to share strengths and improve performance. For example, the tourism committee is seeking to stimulate the development of a regional cruise ship industry. It will require the development of standardized regional regulatory and operational procedures to be adopted by the shipping industry. The Tourism Committee should engage the Transportation Committee to work jointly on such an effort. Currently there is no such collaboration.

Likewise, the development of human resources for health is a major initiative for the Health Committee, yet it is not included in the RWDC strategic plan. The Health Committee would benefit greatly from the expertise and workforce training funding that the RWDC could facilitate.

- Diversified funding

Having the ability to offer a cross-sectoral approach to solving initiatives will increase the types of funding various committees can qualify for. For example the Transportation Committee might not be aware that, through the development of a “Food Security” program currently being funded through sources associated with the Health Committee, funding for the development of enhanced transportation links between the islands might be possible.

- Increased committee activity

The Energy Committee, Transportation Committee and Telecommunications Committees are clearly not performing to their potential. The need for these committees is just as great as for any other, yet without technical assistance and oversight it is not likely that there will be any measurable improvement in their status. By assisting these committees to be fully functional, the programmatic and policy portfolio of the MCES will be enhanced.

---

### ***4. EXTERNAL CHALLENGES***

---

- Destructive competition

Without a means of coordinating committee activity, unhealthy competition is likely for the attention of the MCES. This will further frustrate cross-committee cooperation and collaboration and diminish the impact of the MCES.

- Loss of key policy and programmatic initiatives

Without assistance in organization, fund raising and coordination, the MCES structure or system of committees will continue to function without the ability to address key policy areas such as transportation, energy and telecommunications that otherwise would be possible if fully functioning committees were in place.

- Top down and bottom up synergies

Committee effectiveness can be expanded through clear and frequently updated visions enunciated by the Chief Executives. Likewise, visions of the Chief Executives can be expanded and improved through better committee performance.

## ACTION PLAN

---

---

The findings of the investigation confirmed that there were a number of discrete actions that, if executed by the Micronesia Center for a Sustainable Future (MCSF), could significantly enhance the impact and effectiveness of the committees in generating positive regional outcomes.

When asked to identify what the purpose of the Micronesia Center for a Sustainable Future (MCSF) was, those respondents that had heard of the MCSF indicated they believed it was created to provide the ability for the MCSF to support the committees and provide administrative and technical support to the summit process by providing technical assistance and managing the summits. When asked what sort of support was specifically desired, four broad goals emerged that committee members considered important to supporting committee programs:

### **1. To develop/improve committee strategic planning**

The level of strategic planning at the committee level varies greatly. Some committees have complete strategic plans, some are currently in the process (Micronesia Challenge) of developing one and some have not even begun (Communications/Transportation, etc.). Without identifying the Committees mission and objectives, it is difficult to move toward project identification and implementation. It would therefore be wise to provide the capacity to each committee to meet its strategic planning needs. Ultimately, the ability to establish short, medium and long term initiatives and to fund such initiatives to respond to unique committee issues requires the development of a carefully crafted strategic plan.

### **2. To increase collaboration and communication between committees**

The MCSF was seen playing an important role in facilitating cross committee communication and when appropriate, collaboration. The respondents viewed this process as creating ways for the committees to share their experiences, share their knowledge and information, and develop means to compare program objectives and action plans. In addition, the MCSF was envisioned as encouraging and facilitating collaboration between committees. This was viewed as a way to achieve more effective solutions. There exists the perception that collaboration would help to avoid redundant projects.

### **3. To provide technical and organizational assistance**

The committees wish to have the ability to access a regional source for technical assistance. The types of technical assistance desired ranged broadly. For example, the Micronesia Challenge is seeking to standardize scientific evaluative measures for environmental outcomes. The RISC committee is also interested in this type of assistance. Beyond this, the committees are seeking assistance in organizational development, including the review and improvement of committee structures, strategic planning, fund raising, and grant writing services. Additionally, the committees are hopeful that the MCSF will play an important role in assisting the implementation of the semi-annual MCES meetings by assisting the host jurisdictions with planning and event management.

### **4. To facilitate the Chief Executives in establishing a regional framework of priorities and objectives**

A commonly expressed concern was that it remains unclear how the Chief Executives define what represents a regional initiative they believe should be part of the MCES process. While all of the committees value their ability to shape MCES regional activities, it is becoming increasingly difficult to determine if projects and initiatives are contributing to a shared regional perspective or some sort of regional framework. For example, the Health Committee and the Micronesia Challenge believe that their programs should more strongly define how the Chief Executives select and support broader economic, environmental and cultural initiatives.

Some of the committees (such as Health and RISC) also feel they are forced to compete for the attention of the MCES. They believe that instead of a top down approach to regional planning and policy development, the lobbying that occurs in the summit process is more important to obtaining support from the Chiefs and determines how certain projects are endorsed and others are not. This process is considered inefficient and creates confusion as to what the MCES is trying to accomplish regionally. In addition, it is viewed as frustrating the ability of committees to leverage MCES support for broader and larger initiatives, as it is unclear if the MCES has adopted a clear regional vision or policy framework.

These broad goals determine a set of practical initiatives and objectives that help to define an action plan. It remains unclear how such a plan might be implemented and by whom; however, the steps described are consistent with the deliverables identified in the MCSF grant currently being administered by the Graduate School.

## **GOAL: TO DEVELOP/IMPROVE COMMITTEE STRATEGIC PLANNING:**

### **Objectives:**

1. To facilitate the development of strategic plans for those committees that currently do not have one

The only committee that currently has a published regional strategic plan dedicated to issues specific to the MCES is the RWDC. The Micronesian Challenge, RISC and the Health Committee are in the process of developing strategic plans, and other committees, such as the energy committee, the transportation Committee and the telecommunications Committee have no written plans. The Tourism Committee is pursuing marketing strategies as well as industrial strategies, such as the development of a cruise ship industry plan, but not a strategic plan that is designed for the MCES as of yet.

However, without a written strategic plan, it is impossible to determine how committee objectives or how collaboration can best be achieved. The committees believe one of the tasks of the MCSF is to assist the committees in completing strategic plans that can be reviewed by the MCES and the other committees.

## **GOAL: INCREASE AND IMPROVE INTER COMMITTEE COLLABORATION AND COMMUNICATION:**

### **Objectives:**

1. To map initiatives and objectives identified in the strategic plans of each of the committees

The purpose of this exercise will be to identify those projects and programs that have shared objectives, where collaboration would be useful in terms of fund raising, program development and execution as well as sharing resources.

2. To develop an electronic MCSF Information Portal and web page

The web page would provide a central location where committees could share information and communicate with other committees in the development and execution of programs. The site would also provide blogs to assist committee members to engage other committees in projects and programs they are pursuing.

3. To assist the committees in facilitating regional participation

The committees generally are under-resourced financially and need assistance in bringing key members to regional meetings to work directly with other committee members or to fully participate in the MCES. The committees are hopeful that the MCSF will be able to assist by funding transportation and lodging for committee members to attend key regional meetings.

## **GOAL: TO PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

### **Objectives:**

1. To develop a resource listing of national, regional and international technical resources appropriate for each committee

This resource listing would include consultants, universities and private research and planning organizations already engaged in programs and projects of interest to the committees of the MCES or with specific skill or information sets important to the committees. The MCSF would assist by locating specific types of expertise and would assist the committees in trying to identify funding for technical assistance projects the committees would require.

2. To develop a grant writing and fund-raising capability for the MCES

The committees hope that MCSF can develop a grant-writing and fundraising capability to complement and support the work currently being undertaken, particularly for committees that currently have no capacity to raise funding either through grants or other means. An essential part of that exercise will be to map the funding needs of the committees over the short, medium and long--term, identifying possible sources and establishing contact with key donor agencies on behalf of the committees and the MCES.

3. To staff and manage the MCES process

The committees are looking to the MCSF to provide a permanent staffing capability for the MCES in planning and managing the summits and the op-going work of the committees and in assisting the host jurisdictions in hosting the semi-annual meetings. Part of this process will involve devising ways to improve the effectiveness and impact of the involvement of the committees in the MCES summit process.

## **GOAL: TO FACILITATE THE CHIEF EXECUTIVES IN ESTABLISHING A REGIONAL FRAMEWORK OF PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES.**

### **Objectives:**

#### **1. To convene a conference on regional priorities**

The military buildup has created a regional impact larger than any since the dissolution of the Trust Territories. The U.S. Military and international donor agencies, such as the ADB, WHO, SPC, AUSAID, are interested in learning what the development, social and cultural priorities of the members of the MCES are going to be over the next five to ten years. Of specific interest is how the jurisdictions of the MCES are planning to utilize the economic development effects of the buildup to the benefit of the region. The conference would be a relatively high profile initiative to discuss all of the issues of importance to the MCES and their committees: workforce development, sustainable environmental conservation, healthcare, visitor industry development, telecommunications, energy, invasive species, and solid waste management. The conference would yield an approach to these issues demonstrating how the communities of the region are working together with the international community and the military to maximize the benefits the buildup can provide the region. The result of the conference would be a series of priorities and concerns that the Chief Executives are advised to consider as they proceed with the development of a regional framework designed to maximize the benefits the \$20 billion military buildup investment.

#### **2. To convene a visioning process on behalf of the Chief Executives**

Subsequent to the conference, the Chief Executives would be requested to appoint a small group from each jurisdiction to participate in a formal visioning process to develop a vision statement and mission statement for the MCES. The process would provide the foundation and the framework for an MCES strategic plan for the next 10 years. The mission and vision would be designed to maximize the economic, social, and environmental benefits that the military buildup could deliver regionally. The results would be presented both individually to the Chief Executives and then as a group at a retreat to discuss their revisions and shaping of both the vision statement and mission for the organization for the next 10 years to capitalize on the buildup.

#### **3. To publicly unveil the strategic direction of the MCES at the next summit**

The framework, with its vision and mission statements would be shared with the regional community at the subsequent MCES. That framework would be publicized as shaping the regional MCES policy going forward and the committees would be called upon to execute their initiatives in pursuit of fulfilling that framework. Strategic plans for all of the committees demonstrating how the framework would be accomplished would be revealed as well as the administrative, technical and planning assistance the MCSF would provide to support these plans. The event would be a high profile occasion, intended to draw international attention to the direction and intentions of the MCES over the next ten years.

---

#### TASK ITEMS, BUDGET AND TIMING

- Task: To facilitate the development of strategic plans for those committees that currently do not have one

- ❖ Items:

- To develop a standardized strategic planning template for all committees.
- To review the template with all committees via email and conference calls.
- To convene meetings with committee members to facilitate development of the strategic plan for each committee.
- To meet with the committee at the subsequent MCES to review and approve the strategic plan for each of the committees. Currently, as many as 8 but most likely 6 committees will require assistance in developing strategic plans.

- ❖ Resource commitment:

| Committee Strategic Plan Development                      |                      |           |          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|----------|
| Task                                                      | Man Days @ \$450/day | Materials | Total    |
| To develop strategic planning template.                   | 5                    |           | \$2,250  |
| To review the template                                    | 3                    | \$500     | \$1,850  |
| To convene webinars to facilitate strategic plans         | 60                   | \$500     | \$27,500 |
| To meet and approve the plans for each of the committees. | 2                    |           | \$2,000  |
| Total                                                     |                      |           | \$33,600 |

- Task: To map initiatives and objectives identified in the strategic plans of each of the committees

- Items

- To compare all of the written strategic plans to identify where there appear to shared or similar objectives, resource needs, and program overlaps.
- To prepare a written summary for review by all committees to identify areas for collaboration and new communication pathways.

- ❖ Resource commitment:

| Committee Strategic Plan Development |                      |           |         |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| Task                                 | Man Days @ \$450/day | Materials | Total   |
| Plan comparisons                     | 5                    |           | \$2,250 |
| Summary report                       | 3                    | \$500     | \$1,850 |
| Total                                |                      |           | \$4,100 |

- Task: To develop an electronic MCSF Information Portal and web page

- ❖ Items

- To create a creative brief for the portal and webpage for the MCSF.
- To program and design the portal and webpage.
- To populate the page with information from the various committees and the MCES.

❖ Resource Requirement

| Committee Strategic Plan Development |                       |           |          |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------|
| Task                                 | Man<br>Days@\$450/day | Materials | Total    |
| Portal/Web Page Creative Brief       | 5                     |           | \$2,250  |
| Page Development and Programming     |                       | \$14,000  | \$14,000 |
| Content Build                        | 5                     |           | \$2,250  |
| Search Engine Optimization           |                       | \$15,000  | \$15,000 |
| Total                                |                       |           | \$33,500 |

- Task: To assist the committees in facilitating regional participation

❖ Items

- To fund committees unable to afford participation at the MCES meetings.
- To fund participation by committees at semi-annual committee meetings to be funded from compact funding for the FAS states and from DOI technical assistance funding for an initial five year period. The grant would accommodate airfare and lodging at the location of the event. The meetings would occur prior to the MCES meetings and would coincide with meetings of the designated representatives of the MCES in preparation for the next MCES meeting. The purpose of the meetings would be to:
  - To facilitate cross committee networking,
  - To identify plans to be presented at the subsequent MCES meeting,
  - To conduct committee workshops on specific issues of importance to the region as a whole that cross committee collaboration is important.
  - To facilitate interaction between the MCSF and the committees and the designated representatives to obtain input for conducting the MCES meeting.

❖ Resource Requirement

| Committee Semi-Annual Networking Meetings |                       |           |          |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------|
| Task                                      | Man<br>Days@\$450/day | Materials | Total    |
| Program and meeting design                | 10                    |           | \$4,500  |
| Event Management                          | 20                    |           | \$9,000  |
| Venue Expenses (facilities and F&B)       |                       | \$30,000  | \$30,000 |
| Committee Travel and Lodging              |                       | \$45,000  | \$45,000 |
| Report write-up and reporting             | 10                    |           | \$4,500  |
| Total                                     |                       |           | \$93,000 |

- To develop a resource listing among national, regional and international technical resources capable and involved with issues being pursued by the committees

❖ Items:

- To canvass the committees to develop a universal listing of resources.
- To interact with regional private and public sector resource agencies to identify specific regional and international resource agency and organizations.
- To establish an resource communications component and blog within the web page/portal for MCSF.

❖ Resource Requirement

| Development of Resource Listing  |                    |           |         |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------|
| Task                             | Man Days@\$450/day | Materials | Total   |
| Program Design                   | 3                  |           | \$1,350 |
| Resource Requirements Identified | 3                  |           | \$1,350 |
| Funding Sources Secured          | 5                  |           | \$2,250 |
| Total                            |                    |           | \$4,950 |

• To develop a grant writing and funding capability for the MCES

❖ Items

- Program design
- Resource requirements identified
- Funding sources secured

❖ Resource Requirement

| Grant Writing Capability Established |                    |           |          |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------|
| Task                                 | Man Days@\$450/day | Materials | Total    |
| Resource Sourcing from Committees    | 10                 |           | \$4,500  |
| Resource Solicitation and Inclusion  | 7                  |           | \$3,150  |
| Programming and Portal Development   |                    | \$7,500   | \$7,500  |
| Total                                |                    |           | \$15,150 |

• To staff and manage the MCES process

❖ Items

- Plan and design the MCES event

- Coordinate logistics and pre-event management
- Event management
- Post event reporting for the MCES

❖ Resource Requirements

| MCES Meeting Process Management Per Year |                    |           |          |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------|
| Task                                     | Man Days@\$450/day | Materials | Total    |
| MCES Event Design                        | 10                 |           | \$4,500  |
| Logistics and Pre-Event Management       | 10                 |           | \$4,500  |
| Event Management                         | 20                 |           | \$9,000  |
| Post Event Reporting                     | 10                 |           | \$4,500  |
| Total                                    |                    |           | \$22,500 |

- To convene a conference on regional priorities

❖ Items

- Jurisdiction survey of elites and decision makers
- Event design
- Logistics and pre-event management
- Event management
- Post event reporting

❖ Resource Requirements

| Regional Priorities/Visioning Conference       |                    |           |          |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------|
| Task                                           | Man Days@\$450/day | Materials | Total    |
| Pre event Survey of elites and decision-makers |                    | 15,000    | 15,000   |
| Event Design                                   | 10                 |           | \$4,500  |
| Logistics and Pre-Event Management             | 20                 |           | \$9,000  |
| Event Management                               |                    | 50,000    | \$50,000 |
| Post Event Report for the Chief Executives     | 20                 |           | \$9,000  |
| Conference Costs                               | 10                 |           | \$4,500  |
| Total                                          |                    |           | \$92,000 |

- To convene a visioning process on behalf of the Chief Executives

❖ Items

- To design and develop an event and program design
- Pre-event logistics and management
- Event management of the conference
- Post event report and presentation

❖ Resource Requirements

| Regional Priorities/Visioning Conference   |                    |           |          |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------|
| Task                                       | Man Days@\$450/day | Materials | Total    |
| Event Design                               | 10                 |           | \$4,500  |
| Logistics and Pre-Event Management         | 20                 |           | \$9,000  |
| Event Management                           |                    | 50,000    | \$50,000 |
| Post Event Report for the Chief Executives | 20                 |           | \$9,000  |
| Conference Costs                           | 10                 |           | \$4,500  |
| Total                                      |                    |           | \$77,000 |