



SHAPING OUR FUTURE

FEBRUARY 28 – MARCH 2, 2006
NATIONAL CONSERVATION TRAINING CENTER
SHEPHERDSTOWN, WEST VIRGINIA

SUMMARY REPORT:
WORKSHOP OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS

MARCH 10, 2006

PREPARED BY:
FEDERAL MANAGEMENT
PARTNERS, INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
BACKGROUND.....	6
GENESIS OF ‘SHAPING OUR FUTURE’ WORKSHOP	6
WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES	7
KEY WORKSHOP EVENTS.....	9
OVERVIEW OF BREAKOUT SESSIONS	9
PLENARY SESSIONS – DAY ONE.....	10
PLENARY SESSIONS – DAY TWO	11
PLENARY SESSIONS – DAY THREE	12
PARTICIPANT RECOMMENDATIONS & ACTION PLAN.....	14
RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DIRECTORATE	14
ACTION PLAN	16
NEXT STEPS.....	18
APPENDIX A: WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS.....	A-1
APPENDIX B: DIRECTOR’S MESSAGE – ‘SHAPING OUR FUTURE’	B-1
APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT INPUT.....	C-1
APPENDIX D: MODIFIED WORKSHOP AGENDA	D-1
APPENDIX E: COMPILATION OF BREAKOUT SESSION NOTES - DAY ONE	E-1
APPENDIX F: COMPILATION OF BREAKOUT SESSION NOTES - DAY TWO	F-1
APPENDIX G: COMPILATION OF BREAKOUT SESSION NOTES - DAY THREE	G-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service held a ‘Shaping our Future’ workshop from February 28 to March 2, 2006 at the National Conservation Training Center. Over 75 Assistant Regional Directors, Division Chiefs and other key staff involved in workforce planning attended the workshop. In addition, members of the Directorate and many of their Deputies were in attendance for concurrent meetings. This report provides a summary of the events and outcomes of the workshop.

The workshop was structured so that the first day would focus on the emerging trends and changes facing the Service and on setting strategic direction. The second day of the workshop was intended to focus on workforce planning and on envisioning the future workforce of the Service. Early on the second day, it became clear that the participants wanted and needed to spend more time and energy on the strategic direction before they turned to the task of workforce planning.

In cross-program breakout discussions, participants identified specific recommendations for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of Service operations. The group members ‘left their programs at the door,’ and brainstormed ways to become more integrated as ‘one Service’ both in terms of the mission and from an operational standpoint.

“We’re Ready to Go!”

One of the strongest messages from the workshop participants is that they are very engaged and do not want to lose momentum. They are ready to put their program loyalties aside and work as ‘one Service.’ They feel the urgency and are ready to do the work and make the tough decisions; they hope and need for the Directorate to be equally committed and to take swift, decisive action.

The workshop participants made the following recommendations to the Directorate:

1. Begin with the end in mind: Develop a strategic vision with guiding principles that expands on the ‘Shaping our Future’ memo; communicate the vision to all levels
2. Let form follow function: Reduce the focus on programs; instead, focus on conservation priorities – let biology and ecology drive determination of focal areas (e.g., trust species, refuges, habitats)
3. Shift from statute to stature: Increase emphasis on partnerships and outreach programs; ‘lead from behind’
4. Provide incentives (and remove disincentives) for cross-program activities and behaviors; hold people accountable
5. Develop metrics and consistent standards for evaluating the effectiveness of projects, initiatives, programs and organizations
6. Delegate more authority to the field: Streamline the Washington Office and Regional Offices – review organization for duplication and inefficiencies
7. Establish service centers for support functions (e.g., budget, finance, human resources, information technology, procurement)

8. Co-locate offices in the field – create Fish & Wildlife Field Offices rather than program offices
9. Reduce reliance on rented or leased property – work toward goal of ‘no rent in fifteen years’
10. Develop and/or hire for the competencies that will support these changes: teamwork, collaboration, negotiation, mediation, communication; train all employees to be leaders from Day One; provide dual career track for technical leadership

The following action plan translates these recommendations into more concrete steps with suggested timeframes and responsibilities.

ACTION ITEMS	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TIMEFRAME
STRATEGIC PRIORITIES/CROSS-PROGRAM INITIATIVES (THE ‘WHAT’)		
1. Develop strategic vision for the Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Conservation Constitution’ • Include guiding principles, definition of terms 	Director	April 2006 Directorate meeting
2. Develop common criteria for identifying resource-based, geographic/topical focus areas	Science Advisors – prepare input for Director’s Memo	Memo issued April 1, 2006
3. Develop resource-based metrics and templates for reporting on and holding managers accountable for outcomes	Science Advisors – prepare input for Director’s Memo	Memo issued April 1, 2006
4. Identify top priorities for cross-program initiatives	Directorate	FY 2008 budget
5. Identify cross-programmatic team to further develop shared approach to resource-based conservation planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard operating procedures • Scientific practices • Prioritization guidelines • Adaptive management procedures • Incentives/removal of barriers • Cross-program training/experiences 	Identify Team – Directorate Team Members – Cross-program participants at various levels	Identify Team and Begin Now
6. Apply budget resources to support Service assets in given focus areas	Directorate	October 1, 2006
7. Develop an Adaptive Organizational Management Guide	Directorate	June 2006
OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY (THE ‘HOW’)		
8. Complete Washington Office Organizational Review	Directorate	June 2006
9. Evaluate locations for the Washington	Management Efficiency	June 2006

ACTION ITEMS	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TIMEFRAME
Office outside Arlington, VA	Oversight Committee of the Directorate	
10. Develop a plan to consolidate management practices and procedures for grants	Management Efficiency Oversight Committee of the Directorate	July 2006; implement in FY 07
11. Develop Service-wide policy and targets for ratios of salaries, fixed costs, and discretionary funding to support field operations	Director/Regional Directors	July 1, 2006
12. Evaluate service center approach to providing support services	Management Efficiency Oversight Committee of the Directorate	August 2006
13. Issue Director's Order on rewarding increases in efficiency; remove disincentives	Director	October 1, 2006
14. Transfer designated signature authority to the lowest level possible (i.e., the field)	Assistant Directors	Begin in FY 07
COMMUNICATIONS & OUTREACH (THE 'HOW')		
15. Develop communications & outreach plan for every major resource management action	Directorate, with help from External Affairs	June 2006
16. Deploy External Affairs staff to the field	Directorate/External Affairs	FY 07
WORKFORCE PLANNING (THE 'HOW')		
17. Give the authority/make it easier to use existing flexibilities for recruitment, relocation, etc.	Director	April 2006
18. Establish a workforce planning steering team to integrate workforce planning with other strategic efforts	Directorate	April 2006
19. Conduct a review of all existing workforce plans and apply to the development of a Service-wide workforce plan	Workforce Planning Steering Team	March 2007
20. Develop a technical leadership track for advancement that does not require supervision responsibilities	NCTC	FY 07

The participants left the workshop ready to get to work on shaping the future of the Service. They are looking to the Directorate to act swiftly and decisively; to act on short-term recommendations quickly (for the FY '08 budget) and to make decisions and commit resources to long-term recommendations. The Directorate's commitment and follow-through is critical to keep the momentum going, as is ongoing communication with all levels of Service employees.

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service held a ‘Shaping our Future’ workshop from February 28 to March 2, 2006 at the National Conservation Training Center. Over 75 Assistant Regional Directors, Division Chiefs and other key staff involved in workforce planning attended the workshop (See Appendix A for the list of workshop participants). In addition, members of the Directorate and many of their Deputies were in attendance for concurrent meetings.

GENESIS OF ‘SHAPING OUR FUTURE’ WORKSHOP

The workshop was first conceived at a Directorate meeting in early 2005, when a number of internal and external events highlighted the need for the Directorate to become more effective as a leadership team in order to address changing operational needs. The early stages of planning for the workshop began during the summer. After Dale Hall was confirmed as the new Director in October 2005, he reaffirmed the need to act quickly and issued a message to all employees in December entitled ‘Shaping our Future’ (see Appendix B).

The Director’s message acknowledged that the Service is at a crossroads, and that there are many events and issues driving changes in how the Service operates and interacts with the outside world. Through this message, the Director clearly articulated the imperative for change.

The Service’s work is excellent, but we cannot afford to approach our work with a ‘business as usual’ attitude. To have the most control of our destiny and our priorities – rather than having them decided for us – we must expect change, and manage for it.

***Mr. Dale Hall, Director, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
December 19, 2005***

The Director also provided the following broad outline of the direction he feels the Service needs to take over the next few years:

- Emphasize working cooperatively with others. Expand our use of collaborative approaches to resource conservation.
- Develop a more integrated approach to problem solving. Work together and share resources to get the job done.
- Make choices and find efficiencies in both resource and business management practices. We can’t do all the things we’ve done in the past, because those demands exceed our resources and we have new demands that require our attention.
- Learn new skills and competencies to adapt and lead through change. Change brings opportunity if we are prepared to embrace it.

Finally, the Director announced that planning was under way for this workshop. He described the workshop as a first step in shaping the future of the Service’s workforce and organization in order to meet the Service’s priority conservation goals over the next three to five years. He also emphasized the need to develop an integrated, Service-wide approach that addresses cross-program workforce issues. Additional objectives for the workshop included:

- Share information on workforce planning from those efforts currently under way so that the entire organization can benefit from their experience.
- Examine immediate staffing and organizational needs and solutions to position the workforce and organization to succeed in the future.
- Develop recommendations for how to be more efficient and effective.

When the Directorate sits down in April to begin the challenging process of putting together the 2008 budget, I want the benefit of your thoughts on how the Service can best meet these challenges.

Mr. Dale Hall, Director, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
December 19, 2005

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

The workshop planning team* developed the following objectives for the workshop:

1. Discuss emerging trends and changes that are affecting the Service now, and will affect the Service in the next five to ten years, and beyond
2. Share information on workforce planning from efforts currently under way at the Service
3. Identify necessary changes in the workforce and the resulting staffing and organizational needs
4. Develop action plans for moving forward with proactively shaping the future of the Service

To accomplish these objectives, the planning team developed an agenda that provided a mix of key Department and Service leaders, internal and external keynote speakers, and breakout sessions.

In preparation for the workshop, the Director asked participants to solicit input from their staff and identify up to three critical issues that they believe will affect the Service's workforce over the next five to ten years. He asked for issues that, if not addressed, could impact the Service's ability to accomplish its mission. In addition, the workshop planning team collected input from key members of the Service who were involved in the earlier planning stages of the workshop†, and a cohort of students and coaches in the Advanced Leadership Development Program.

Although a variety of issues were raised, six strong themes emerged from the input provided by all sources (see Appendix C for the Summary of Input):

* The following people were part of the workshop planning team: Dave Allen, Regional Director of the Pacific Region (R1); Denise Sheehan, Assistant Director, Budget, Planning & Human Resources; Kevin Adams, Chief, Office of Law Enforcement; Rick Lemon, Director, National Conservation Training Center; Benito Perez, Deputy Chief, Office of Law Enforcement; Debbie Kolen, Division of Human Resources; Dick Georgen, Division of Human Resources; and Lisa Sper, Consultant, Federal Management Partners.

† The following people were involved in the earlier stages of planning for the workshop: David Viker, Dean Rundle, Jim Kurth, Ken Berg, Kenneth McDermond, Tom Worthington, and Bob Batky.

1. Retirements and other attrition over the next five years will result in the loss of valuable institutional knowledge, management expertise, and leadership capability.
2. Demographic changes and shifting cultural values regarding conservation have resulted in different expectations of the Service by its public, as well as changes in the make-up of the publics we serve.
3. Declining or flat budgets will require the Service to identify and focus on its priority mission and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of operations.
4. Ecological and environmental changes and resource stresses will require continual monitoring and an increased emphasis on new technologies and specialization.
5. In order to be successful in the future, we need to shape the Service's workforce in an intentional way.
6. Widespread change has made it necessary to refine the Service's business model and review assumptions about our core functions, structure and values.

These themes were used as a starting point for discussions at the workshop, geared toward accomplishing the stated objectives.

KEY WORKSHOP EVENTS

The workshop was structured so that the first day would focus on the emerging trends and changes facing the Service and on setting strategic direction. The second day was intended to focus on workforce planning and on envisioning the future workforce of the Service. On the last day, participants had the opportunity to develop recommendations and action plans for the Directorate.

Early on the second day of the workshop, it became clear that the participants wanted and needed to spend more time and energy on the strategic direction before they turned to the task of workforce planning. They also valued the time they could spend in cross-program breakout discussions more than the plenary sessions planned for that day. In response to these requirements, the workshop focus and agenda for the second and third days were modified accordingly (See Appendix D for the modified workshop agenda).

The following sections provide brief summaries of the breakout sessions and plenary sessions that took place throughout the workshop.

OVERVIEW OF BREAKOUT SESSIONS

On the first day, workshop participants met with other members of their programs to discuss the impact of emerging trends and changes such as those identified in their pre-work and keynote addresses. The breakout groups focused on identifying and prioritizing the strategic issues affecting the programs. They also discussed the core program values that they wanted to be sure to retain as well as those aspects of their mission that they recognized may change. Finally, they shared suggestions for how the Service could operate more efficiently and effectively.

The following are some themes that emerged from the breakout sessions on the first day (see Appendix E for a compilation of the breakout group discussions from Day One):

Value/Mission Changes

- Shift from emphasis on regulation and control, to emphasis on partnerships, influence and outreach (statute to stature)
- Focus on landscape conservation planning, program integration, geographical focus areas
- Focus on communication, coordination and integration – internal and external
- Develop trust – in and of the public as well as internally
- Be more proactive and strategic, less reactive and opportunistic
- Focus on leadership development

Efficiency Changes

- Establish service centers for administrative functions
- Co-locate offices in the field
- Delegate more authority to the field
- Streamline Regional Office organization
- Review Washington Office organization
- Establish standards and consistency

On Days Two and Three, the breakout groups were shuffled to provide an opportunity for cross-program and multi-region discussion. The purpose of the breakout session on Day Two was modified to give the groups an opportunity to have discussions similar to those on Day One, but with an emphasis on cross-program integration rather than program-specific issues.

In the breakout discussions on Day Two, participants began to identify specific recommendations for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of Service operations. The group members ‘left their programs at the door,’ and brainstormed ways to become more integrated as ‘one Service’ both in terms of the mission and from an operational standpoint. See Appendix F for a summary of the themes from these breakout sessions.

On the final day of the workshop, the agenda was modified to provide more time for breakout discussions. The groups used this time to refine their ideas and develop action plans and recommendations for the Directorate. It was not expected that the groups achieve consensus, but rather that they provide some creative ideas for shaping the future of the Service. See the ‘Participant Recommendations and Action Plan’ section for the consolidated recommendations and action items that came out of the workshop. See Appendix G for a compilation of all the breakout group discussions from Day Three.

One of the most powerful outcomes of the workshop was the realization that there is stronger than expected agreement across programs, regions and functions on what critical changes need to take place.

PLENARY SESSIONS – DAY ONE

The workshop opened with addresses from Ms. Lynn Scarlett, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior and Mr. Dale Hall, Director of the Fish & Wildlife Service. These addresses set the stage for the workshop, providing insight into what these key leaders see as the important trends and influences on the Service and what is needed for it to be successful in the 21st century. Some of the trends described by Ms. Scarlett included:

- Public demands for efficient, transparent, accountable government
- Significant demographic and settlement changes, with a growing proximity and access to public lands
- Increasing emphasis on connectedness, shared knowledge, networks, cross-boundary workplaces (e.g., collaboration, partnership, bridge-building)

Cooperative Conservation is the vision for the 21st century. This will require capacity building related to budget priorities, policies, and human resource competencies. Competencies central to cooperative conservation are: relationship management and leadership attributes.

***Ms. Lynn Scarlett, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior
February 28, 2006***

Mr. Dale Hall’s message empowered the participants to act on behalf of the Service, to regroup and refocus on identifying what its priorities should be. He stated that “the answer to that question is in your hands.” He encouraged the group to focus on the core program values that they would fall

on their sword to protect, but also to make the tough decisions and accept responsibility for what needs to change.

I would rather the Service be the best in the world at 15 things than do more things but have no one know who we are...the Service can't be everything to everyone, so it is up to us to tell them who we are and where we are going.

**Mr. Dale Hall, Director, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
February 28, 2006**

Additional keynote speakers on the first day included Mr. Richard Louv, author of *Last Child in the Woods: Saving Our Children From Nature-Deficit Disorder*; Mr. John Baughman, Executive Vice President of the International Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies (IAFWA); and Mr. Larry Schweiger, President & CEO of the National Wildlife Federation. Each of these keynote speakers provided his unique and powerful perspective on the changing world around us and its impact on us as humans, Americans, parents and Service leaders.

Mr. Louv focused on the need to preserve nature and the environment so that we can be sure we are not the 'last generation in the woods.' The Service can play a role by partnering and building bridges with 'environmental educators' to help develop the future 'stewards of the Earth.'

Mr. Baughman addressed the similarities between the issues that the Service faces and those being faced by the states. He provided information on the National Conservation Leadership Institute, a national leadership development program for 35 to 50 of the highest potential leaders from all sectors of the natural resources conservation community.

Mr. Schweiger shared the priority areas identified in the National Wildlife Federation's strategic plan: 1) disconnection to nature; 2) wildlife and wildlife protection; and 3) climate change. He focused on the impact that global climate change has on wildlife, whether through increased storm intensity in the Gulf of Mexico or melting glaciers in Greenland and Siberia.

Finally, two representatives of the Service's National Ecological Assessment Team (NEAT) Initiative, Mr. Craig Czarnecki and Mr. Clint Riley, provided an overview and status of the program and how it will help provide a consistent approach to Strategic Habitat Conservation.

PLENARY SESSIONS – DAY TWO

The second day of the workshop was kicked off with an address from Mr. Matt Hogan, Acting Assistant Secretary, Fish, Wildlife & Parks. Mr. Hogan shared some of his experiences with change and his views on how the Service leadership should position themselves to best manage the changes that are coming. Although the Service has experienced significant changes in the past, we have not always had the opportunity to shape the change in advance. He noted that there are two constants at the Service that position it well during periods of change: 1) the passion of the people for what they do; and 2) the feeling that the Service is like a family.

The greatest legacy that we can leave is the people who lead behind us.

**Mr. Matt Hogan, Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife & Parks
March 1, 2006**

Ms. Debbie Kolen from the Service's Division of Human Resources and Ms. Lisa Sper, a consultant with Federal Management Partners, Inc. provided an introduction to Workforce Planning at the Fish & Wildlife Service. They provided an overview of the drivers of workforce planning, the basic steps to the process, and some background on workforce planning at the Service. Ms. Kolen also addressed some workforce shaping tools that can be available to managers.

Mr. Todd Jones, Chief of the Division of Training at the National Conservation Training Center, spoke about the importance of learning and development, using the framework of the Gallup Engagement Hierarchy. He also shared information about development opportunities and new programs being developed at the National Conservation Training Center.

During lunch, Ms. Donna Kalvels, Director of the Center for Competitive Sourcing Excellence for the Department of the Interior, spoke about the status of competitive sourcing in the Department and the Fish & Wildlife Service. She focused on High Performing Organizations (HPOs) and provided the definitions, criteria and benefits for establishing an HPO.

At the end of the second day, representatives of four programs that have conducted workforce planning over the past few years participated in a panel discussion to share their experiences and lessons learned with interested workshop participants. The panel members were:

- Mr. Benito Perez, Deputy Chief, Office of Law Enforcement
- Mr. James Kurth, Deputy Chief, National Wildlife Refuge System
- Dr. Mamie Parker, Assistant Director for Fisheries & Habitat Conservation
- Ms. Martha Balis-Larsen, Chief, Office of Program Support, Endangered Species

Common lessons learned included the importance of identifying key stakeholders and actively managing change; integrating workforce planning with other planning efforts such as strategic planning, budgeting, competitive sourcing and PART; realizing that workforce planning cannot be done in isolation, but should be done Service-wide; carefully defining the scope and deliverables; and balancing the use of in-house resources and consulting support.

PLENARY SESSIONS – DAY THREE

In the morning, representatives from each of the eight breakout groups shared highlights from their group discussions on the first two days. Members of the Directorate, including Mr. Dale Hall and Mr. Marshall Jones, Deputy Director of the Fish & Wildlife Service, were also in attendance to hear, first-hand, the ideas and recommendations that were surfacing from the group.

“We’re Ready to Go!”

One of the strongest messages from the workshop participants is that they are very engaged and do not want to lose momentum. They are ready to put their program loyalties aside and work as ‘one Service.’ They feel the urgency and are ready to do the work and make the tough decisions; they hope and need for the Directorate to be equally committed and to take swift, decisive action.

The consolidated recommendations generated by the workshop participants are provided in the ‘Participant Recommendations and Action Plan’ section of this report. Compilations of each breakout group’s discussion notes are provided in Appendices E, F and G.

Following the breakout group reports, Mr. Marshall Jones addressed the plenary session. Mr. Jones shared some of the efforts that the Directorate has already begun, such as looking at consolidating the grants function, and conducting an organizational review of the Washington Office. He also talked about some possible next steps to the workshop, such as establishing a 'Conservation Constitution' that describes what we need to do to deliver the best services for the American public. The Directorate will review the results of the workshop in preparation for a meeting in early April where they will begin planning for the FY '08 budget. They will identify some 'low-hanging fruit' that can be addressed immediately, and will continue the planning with a focus on implementation by their July meeting.

Finally, after the majority of the day was spent in breakout sessions, Mr. Dale Hall gave his closing address for the workshop. After hearing the ideas and recommendations of the workshop participants, the Director acknowledged a number of themes, including the following:

- Focus on identifying ourselves as 'one Service' – through building trust and beginning with the end in mind
- Focus on conservation priorities, landscape planning, delivering resource conservation on the ground
- Hold people accountable, ensure that leadership is committed, institutionalize the changes, involve the entire organization, get the message out to the field
- Shift emphasis from 'statute' (regulation and control) to 'stature' (influence and partnerships)
- Work toward 'no rent in fifteen years'
- Streamline operations and reduce stress in the field
- Provide adaptive organizational management guidance and tools to managers.

The Director also answered the question, "Where do we go from here?" In addition to the steps already shared by Mr. Jones, he talked about the Management Efficiency Oversight Committee of the Directorate, which will be reviewing and providing recommendations to the Directorate on ways to begin implementing some of the actions from the workshop. This will be an ongoing process, and the workshop participants will need to stay involved and help carry the message to the field. The Director is planning another broadcast address for all employees within the next few months.

Mr. Hall described this effort using a boat analogy – coming out of this workshop, we have the raw materials for building the boat, but we have a lot more work to do before we can use the boat to take the Service into the future.

PARTICIPANT RECOMMENDATIONS & ACTION PLAN

Over the course of three days, workshop participants developed various recommendations and action steps for the Directorate and the Service as a whole. Many breakout groups developed plans with specific actions, responsibilities and timelines. Although there was significant agreement on many of the key actions, there was variation in the specifics and the recommended timelines. This report represents an attempt to consolidate and crystallize the breakout group recommendations into a single plan. Refer to Appendix G for the individual breakout group recommendations and action plans.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE DIRECTORATE

The participants left the workshop ready to get to work on shaping the future of the Service. They are looking to the Directorate to act swiftly and decisively; to act on short-term recommendations quickly (for the FY '08 budget) and to make decisions and commit resources to long-term recommendations. The Directorate's commitment and follow-through is critical to keep the momentum going, as is ongoing communication with all levels of Service employees.

The workshop participants made the following recommendations to the Directorate:

1. Begin with the end in mind: Develop a strategic vision with guiding principles that expands on the 'Shaping our Future' memo; communicate the vision to all levels
2. Let form follow function: Reduce the focus on programs; instead, focus on conservation priorities – let biology and ecology drive determination of focal areas (e.g., trust species, refuges, habitats)
3. Shift from statute to stature: Increase emphasis on partnerships and outreach programs; 'lead from behind'
4. Provide incentives (and remove disincentives) for cross-program activities and behaviors; hold people accountable
5. Develop metrics and consistent standards for evaluating the effectiveness of projects, initiatives, programs and organizations
6. Delegate more authority to the field: Streamline the Washington Office and Regional Offices – review organization for duplication and inefficiencies
7. Establish service centers for support functions (e.g., budget, finance, human resources, information technology, procurement)
8. Co-locate offices in the field – create Fish & Wildlife Field Offices rather than program offices
9. Reduce reliance on rented or leased property – work toward goal of 'no rent in fifteen years'
10. Develop and/or hire for the competencies that will support these changes: teamwork, collaboration, negotiation, mediation, communication; train all employees to be leaders from day one; provide a career track for technical leadership

Two Proposed Vision Statements

We want the FWS to be more:

Focused, so that our efforts are not diluted;

Strategic, such that we are making conscious decisions about where and how to use our funding and people to accomplish specific goals across programs;

Lean, in our organizational structure so that we can put more resources toward on-the-ground mission accomplishment;

Efficient in our operations and our business practices so that we can put more resources toward on-the-ground mission accomplishment; and

Integrated and united with one identity that is relevant to the American public

So that in the end, we are ***more effective*** in accomplishing our mission on-the-ground.



Statute to Stature: Move from a history of power and control to a focus on influence, collaboration and voluntary compliance; to achieve strategic landscape level conservation, stewardship and protection. This will be done through cross-program coordination, inter-regional cooperation and external partnerships.

ACTION PLAN

The following action plan translates these recommendations into more concrete steps with suggested timeframes and responsibilities.

ACTION ITEMS	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TIMEFRAME
STRATEGIC PRIORITIES/CROSS-PROGRAM INITIATIVES (THE ‘WHAT’)		
1. Develop strategic vision for the Service <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Conservation Constitution” • Include guiding principles, definitions 	Director	April 2006 Directorate meeting
2. Develop common criteria for identifying resource-based, geographic/topical focus areas	Science Advisors – prepare input for Director’s Memo	Issue Memo April 1, 2006
3. Develop resource-based metrics and templates for reporting on and holding managers accountable for outcomes	Science Advisors – prepare input for Director’s Memo	Issue Memo April 1, 2006
4. Identify top priorities for cross-program initiatives	Directorate	FY 2008 budget
5. Identify a cross-program team to further develop shared approach to resource-based conservation planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard operating procedures • Scientific practices • Prioritization guidelines • Adaptive management procedures • Incentives/removal of barriers • Cross-program training/experiences 	Team Identified by Directorate Team Members – Cross-program participants at various levels	Identify Team and Begin Now
6. Develop an Adaptive Organizational Management Guide	Directorate	June 2006
7. Apply budget resources to support Service assets in given focus areas	Directorate	October 1, 2006
OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY (THE ‘HOW’)		
8. Complete Washington Office Organizational Review	Directorate	June 2006
9. Evaluate locations for the Washington Office outside Arlington, VA	Management Efficiency Oversight Committee of the Directorate	June 2006
10. Develop a plan to consolidate management practices and procedures for grants	Management Efficiency Oversight Committee of the Directorate	July 2006; implement in FY 07
11. Develop Service-wide policy and targets for ratios of salaries, fixed costs, and discretionary funding to support field operations	Director/Regional Directors	July 1, 2006

ACTION ITEMS	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TIMEFRAME
12. Evaluate service center approach to providing support services	Management Efficiency Oversight Committee of the Directorate	August 2006
13. Issue Director's Order on rewarding increases in efficiency; remove disincentives	Director	October 1, 2006
14. Transfer designated signature authority to the lowest level possible (i.e., the field)	Assistant Directors	Begin in FY 07
COMMUNICATIONS & OUTREACH (THE 'HOW')		
15. Develop communications & outreach plan for every major resource management action	Directorate, with help from External Affairs	June 2006
16. Deploy External Affairs staff to the field	Directorate/External Affairs	FY 07
WORKFORCE PLANNING (THE 'HOW')		
17. Give the authority/make it easier to use existing flexibilities for recruitment, relocation, etc.	Director	April 2006
18. Establish a workforce planning steering team to integrate workforce planning with other strategic efforts	Directorate	April 2006
19. Conduct a review of all existing workforce plans and apply to the development of a Service-wide workforce plan	Workforce Planning Steering Team	March 2007
20. Develop a technical leadership track for advancement that does not require supervision responsibilities	NCTC	FY 07

NEXT STEPS

The Directorate will be meeting to discuss the FY '08 budget during the first week of April 2006. The Management Efficiency Oversight Committee of the Directorate has been charged to review the results of the workshop and identify recommendations on ways to incorporate some of these actions into the budget for FY '08.

Part of this review will be to determine which of the following categories the workshop participants' recommendations and actions fall into:

- 'Low-hanging fruit' that can be addressed in FY '08 budget without much additional analysis and discussion.
- Short term actions that are internal and within the Service's control. These actions include efforts to involve employees and obtain additional input from the field so that decisions can be made and have influence on the FY '09 budget formulation process.
- Long term actions that are more complex and involve external coordination and/or require more evaluation and in-depth planning.

The Directorate will refine the action plan based on this review.

An additional next step will be to communicate the results of the workshop to the field, to encourage their input and involvement, and to continue this communication as further progress is made. The Regional Directors and Assistant Directors share the responsibility to ensure that the information is stepped down to all employees. The Director is planning another employee broadcast later this spring, and in the meantime he will be using other means of communication to keep Service employees informed about relevant workforce planning decisions, actions, and events.

This workshop became a strategic planning workshop rather than a workforce shaping workshop, because you need to know your vision and goals to shape that workforce towards them.

Breakout Group Comment

APPENDIX A: WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Region 1

Carolyn Bohan, Regional Chief, National Wildlife Refuge System
Dan Diggs, Assistant Regional Director, Fisheries & Habitat Conservation
Chris McKay, Assistant Regional Director, Migratory Birds & State Programs
David Patte, Assistant Regional Director, External Affairs
Terry Rabot, Assistant Regional Director, Ecological Services
Don Weathers, Assistant Regional Director, Budget & Administration

California/Nevada Operations

Marge Kolar, Assistant Manager, Refuges
Alex Pitts, Assistant Manager, External Affairs

Region 2

Bryan Arroyo, Assistant Regional Director, Ecological Services
Larry Bell, Assistant Regional Director, External Affairs
Jennifer Fowler Probst, Acting Assistant Regional Director FR
Nancy Gloman, Assistant Regional Director, Migratory Birds & State Programs
Stephanie Weagley, Team Lead, Regional Change Team

Region 3

John Christian, Assistant Regional Director, Migratory Birds & State Programs
Nita Fuller, Regional Chief, National Wildlife Refuge System
Don Hultman, Refuge Manager, National Wildlife Refuge System
Gerry Jackson, Assistant Regional Director, Fisheries
Wendy Weber, Assistant Regional Director, Ecological Services

Region 4

Jon Andrew, Chief, National Wildlife Refuge System
Jeff Fleming, Assistant Regional Director, External Affairs
Linda Kelsey, Assistant Regional Director, Fisheries
Bud Oliveira, Acting Chief, National Wildlife Refuge System
Jackie Parrish, Assistant Regional Director, Budget and Administration
Noreen Walsh, Assistant Regional Director, Ecological Services
Emily Jo Williams, Assistant Regional Director, Migratory Birds and State Programs

Region 5

Kathi Bangert, Assistant Regional Director, External Affairs
Jaime Geiger, Assistant Regional Director, Fisheries
Tony Leger, Chief, National Wildlife Refuge System
Sherry Morgan, Assistant Regional Director, Migratory Birds & State Programs
Mike Thabault, Assistant Regional Director, Ecological Services

Region 6

Rick Coleman, Assistant Regional Director, National Wildlife Refuge System
John Cornely, Chief, Division of Migratory Bird Coordination
Julie Lyke, Acting Assistant Regional Director, Ecological Services

Mike Stempel, Assistant Regional Director, Fisheries
Elliott Sutta, Assistant Regional Director, Budget and Administration

Region 7

Doug Alcorn, Assistant Regional Director, Migratory Birds and State Programs
Richard Hannan, Assistant Regional Director, Budget and Administration
Greg Siekaniek, Refuge Manager, Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge
LaVerne Smith, Assistant Regional Director, Fisheries and Ecological Services
Karen Sullivan, Assistant Regional Director, External Affairs

Law Enforcement

Paul Chang, Special Agent-in-Charge, Region 1
James Gale, Special Agent-in-Charge, Region 4
Tom Healy, Special Agent-in-Charge, Region 5
Mary Jane Lavin, Assistant Regional Director, Region 3
Rich McDonald, Special Agent-in-Charge, Region 2
Gary Mowad, Special Agent-in-Charge, Region 6
Stan Pruszenski, Special Agent-in-Charge, Region 7

External Affairs

Christine Eustis, Division Chief, Congressional & Legislative Affairs
Chris Tollefson, Division Chief, Public Affairs

Fisheries and Habitat Conservation

Hannibal Bolton, Division Chief, Fish and Wildlife Management and Habitat Restoration
Tom Busiahn, Branch Chief, Division of Fish and Wildlife Management Assistance
Stuart Leon, Division Chief, National Fish Hatchery System
Greg Masson, Acting Division Chief, Environmental Quality
Dave Stout, Acting Division Chief, Habitat and Resource Conservation

Endangered Species

Martha Balis-Larsen, Chief, Office of Program Support
Rick Sayers, Division Chief, Consultation, HCPs, Recovery and State Grants

National Wildlife Refuge System

Eric Alvarez, Division Chief, Division of Realty
Mark Chase, Division Chief, Division of Refuge Law Enforcement
Ken Grannemann, Division Chief, Office of Information Technology & Management
Brian McManus, Deputy Branch Chief, Branch of Fire Management
Chris Pease, Branch Chief, Wildlife Resources
Allyson Rowell, Division Chief, Visitor Service & Communication
Rick Schultz, Division Chief, Conservation Planning and Policy
Larry Williams, Division of Visitor Service & Communication

International Affairs

Herb Raffaele, Division Chief, Division of International Conservation

Migratory Birds

Robert Blohm, Branch Chief, Surveys and Assessments Branch
Lynn DeLaughter, Division of Migratory Bird Management
Mike Johnson, Deputy Division Chief, Division of Bird Habitat Conservation

David Smith, Division Chief, Division of Bird Habitat Conservation

Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration

Jim Greer, Deputy Division Chief, Division of Federal Assistance

Pam Matthes, Multistate Conservation Grant Program Coordinator, Division of Federal Assistance

Information Resources and Technology Management

Hope Mentore-Smith, Deputy Assistant Director, Division of Information Resources & Technology Management

Business Management Operations

Bob Ashworth, Chief, Contracting and Facilities Management

Chris Jensen, Chief, Division of Financial Management

Paul Rauch, Chief, Division of Engineering

Budget, Planning & Human Resources

Laurie Brooks, Chief, Branch of Policy and Field Liaison, Division of Human Resources

Science Advisor's Office

Bill Knapp, Deputy Science Advisor

**APPENDIX B: DIRECTOR'S MESSAGE
OUR FUTURE'**

'SHAPING

From: Dale Hall/ARL/R9/FWS/DOI
Sent: 12/19/2005 01:40 PM
To: All FWS Employees

Subject: Shaping our Future

Shaping our agency's future is of such critical importance to the Service and the Service family that I have chosen to reach out to every employee with this personal message.

The Service is at a crossroad. To continue our proud tradition of national conservation leadership, we must act decisively and with a clear vision for the future. In the short term, we must prepare for tighter budgets. In the long term, we must position ourselves to maintain strong core functions essential to accomplishing our mission. It is important that you understand why I believe we need to address this matter now. It is also important to have the benefit of your ideas and input.

All of you know there are many events and issues that drive change. Urbanization, economic conditions, shifting national priorities and emergencies such as hurricane recovery all challenge the Federal budget. The public we serve has changed, and has different expectations than they did 20 years ago. They expect that we can accomplish more of our goals through partnerships and voluntary incentives, instead of relying mostly on Federal regulations and land acquisition to protect natural resources, as our predecessors did. Over the past few years we've also seen greater public demand for government agencies to more stringently account for their accomplishments and to be more efficient. This demand will endure because it has bipartisan support. We must excel in both resource management and business management in order to put as much of our limited resources into on-the-ground conservation programs as we possibly can.

The Service's work is excellent, but we cannot afford to approach our work with a 'business as usual' attitude. To have the most control of our destiny and our priorities – rather than having them decided for us – we must expect change, and manage for it. This means we must be the ones making hard decisions regarding what we will do, and what we won't do. These decisions must include careful assessment of the new demands in natural resource and business management that the Service will face in 5 years, in 10 years, and beyond.

Here are some broad outlines of the direction I believe we need to take over the next few years:

- Emphasize working cooperatively with others. Expand our use of collaborative approaches to resource conservation.
- Develop a more integrated approach to problem solving. Work together and share resources to get the job done.
- Make choices and find efficiencies in both resource and business management practices. We can't do all the things we've done in the past, because those demands exceed our resources and we have new demands that require our attention.
- Learn new skills and competencies to adapt and lead through change. Change brings opportunity if we are prepared to embrace it.

We've always 'worked hard and worked smart' in the Service, so I know the people who work in our agency have excellent insights and ideas on where we might adapt to address challenges and best position ourselves for the future. I value your input and involvement in shaping and implementing our new direction.

As a first step, in late February 2006, we will hold a workshop to engage Service leadership in developing an integrated approach to how we shape the workforce and organization in order to succeed. This workshop will focus on how we can position the Service for meeting our priority conservation goals over the next 3 – 5 years, and address cross-program workforce issues. We will look for recommendations about how we can be more efficient and effective, and will examine immediate staffing and organizational needs and solutions to deal with current realities, as well as how we position our workforce and organization to succeed in the future. At this workshop, we will share information on workforce planning from those efforts currently under way in Law Enforcement, Refuges, and Fisheries and Habitat Conservation so that we can all benefit from their experience.

Key participants of the workshop will be the Assistant Regional Directors, Washington Office Division Chiefs, and staff directly involved in current workforce efforts in the Programs. Members of the Directorate and their Deputies will attend.

In preparing for the workshop, we will be conducting employee surveys to help identify direction, needs, issues, and solutions. These efforts will only be the first steps of an ongoing, structured process to engage your thoughts and assistance.

Why are we doing this now? Because I know every one of you is wrestling with change every day, and I want us to be working together and pulling in the same direction. When the Directorate sits down in April to begin the challenging process of putting together the 2008 budget, I want the benefit of your thoughts on how the Service can best meet these challenges.

I am honored and humbled to represent you. I care deeply about our mission and even more deeply about each of you. I consider us family. I will do my best for you, but in return I will need you to be flexible and ready to change with us as we adapt and move forward. I believe we must do our best to prepare for the future; there is no going back, waiting it out, or standing still. Setting our course and moving forward together, is our best option. I know you are up to any challenge, and I look forward to working with you.

APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT INPUT

February 23, 2006

In preparation for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 'Shaping the Future' workforce planning workshop being held from February 28 – March 2, 2006, participants and focus group members were asked to identify at least one, but no more than three, critical issues that they believe will affect the Service workforce in the next 5-10 years. These should be issues that, if not addressed, could impact the Service's ability to accomplish its mission. Input was received from the following sources:

- Workshop participants, representing their programs/regions (39 responses)
- Advanced Leadership Development Program students and coaches not attending the workshop (26)
- Members of the Workforce Planning steering team (9)

The following is a summary of six major themes that were pervasive throughout the input, along with more specific sub-themes and illustrative excerpts from the input provided. The summary is not intended to be all-inclusive, but rather to convey a sense of some of the strongest themes from the input. These themes will be discussed further during Day Two of the workshop, during the luncheon session, and may also be useful during the breakout sessions.

The major themes from the input are the following:

- 1) Retirements and other attrition over the next five years will result in the loss of valuable institutional knowledge, management expertise, and leadership capability.
- 2) Demographic changes and shifting cultural values regarding conservation have resulted in different expectations of the Service by its public, as well as changes in the make-up of the publics we serve.
- 3) Declining or flat budgets will require the Service to identify and focus on its priority mission and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of operations.
- 4) Ecological and environmental changes and resource stresses will require continual monitoring and an increased emphasis on new technologies and specialization.
- 5) In order to be successful in the future, we need to shape the Service's workforce in an intentional way.
- 6) Widespread change has made it necessary to refine the Service's business model and review assumptions about our core functions, structure and values.

The following pages expand on these themes with some specific excerpts from the input provided.

<p>1) Retirements and other attrition over the next five years will result in the loss of valuable institutional knowledge, management expertise, and leadership capability.</p>

- *Succession management* – Identify future leaders and equip them with the skills necessary to fill future retirement vacancies. The Service needs to develop the talent pool and get people the experience they will need to be prepared for these jobs. We also need to identify innovative ways to reward excellence in those NOT headed toward supervisory roles.
- *Leadership development* – In addition to the Advanced Leadership Development Program, use other programs such as the USDA Leadership Program, Service-wide mentoring program, job swaps, details, and online training. Leadership needs to be a major focus of the agency's workforce plan over the next 5-10 years.
- *Preservation of institutional knowledge* – New hires will not have the benefit of the historical context of the Service reflected by its older employees. The Service needs to find ways to transition the institutional knowledge of current leaders to the next generation. We could consider engaging retirees by promoting volunteer work or by bringing them back on contract. We need to consider creating automated repositories for institutional knowledge.

2)

Demographic changes and shifting cultural values regarding conservation have resulted in different expectations of the Service by its public, as well as changes in the make-up of the publics we serve.

- *Changes in the public's experience of nature and conservation* – Natural resource conservation is increasingly experienced via TV or the internet, or not at all. This will change the Service's focus from traditional activities like hunting and fishing, to the public's modern experiences of nature. It will further change the way the Service must market itself to and communicate with the public.
- *The impact of urbanization* – As the U.S. population becomes increasingly urbanized, wildlife, plants, and their habitats are threatened by destruction and degradation. The Service needs to work with its partners to identify, conserve and restore priority habitats in these areas. Urban habitats are important for many trust species as well as urban residents; in order to achieve urban community partnerships and increase public education of wildlife conservation in urban communities, the Service should consider recruiting staff that are willing to work in these areas.
- *Immigrant populations* – Not only does the Service need to concern itself with the growth of a more urban population, but it also must become aware of the rapidly growing immigrant populations that may not have a similar outlook on resource conservation. The Service must make itself more visible to these communities, and realize the need to communicate with, educate, and market to this public.
- *Understanding our primary customers* – The decline of hunters and anglers as the Service's primary customers has revealed a larger public that does not share those traditional values; the Service needs to learn how to reflect the attitudes and beliefs of this constituency base as well. To make wildlife conservation relevant to voters, the American public, we need to determine how to involve them and meet their expectations.
- *Increased emphasis on strategic communications* – The Service needs to be able to communicate its needs/decisions/rationale more effectively to Congress and the public. Both Congress and the public want to be more involved in what the Service does and in their decision making. The Service needs to tap into the growing population that would support the Service but is unaware of what we do and why.

- *Educating the public* – The Service will see a need to concentrate its efforts on public education of wildlife conservation in order to maintain its relevance in society and to increase public awareness. The Service should make it a priority to educate the public with regard to nature conservation and the overall mission of the organization. We must recognize the impact that email and other technology has on the way we communicate with the public and make decisions.

3) Declining or flat budgets will require the Service to identify and focus on its priority mission and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of operations.

- *Prioritization* – Consider defining programs as high or low priorities in regard to achieving the Service’s mission. Put the money that is available toward high priority programs where the Service can make the most progress. This applies not only to the budget itself, but also to the mission of the Service; as staff becomes more preoccupied with process of maintaining a tight budget, it may lose sight of the Service’s overall goal to conserve wildlife, plants, and their habitats.
- *Co-location, complexing, or consolidation* – The Service should consider streamlining the Regional Office HQs or reorganizing the Regional Offices so that they do not all perform the same support functions. We should take advantage of more cross-region/program capabilities in order to minimize its workload and maximize its resources.
- *Balance of salaries and other administrative costs with operational funding* – A large portion of funding is focused on paying salaries, space costs, relocation, etc. which limits the Service’s activities, including the number of projects the Service can take on, project funding with partners, and employee training.
- *Maximizing resources* – Consolidate budget tracking systems in order to reduce amount of redundant administrative work. Mandatory maintenance of uncoordinated logging/reporting systems also wastes time. The Service is not up-to-date/up-to-speed in technological applications that could improve efficiencies, cut costs and improve customer service.
- *Implementing a manageable workforce plan* – The Service must come up with a more realistic approach to workforce planning that can be implemented with current budget. It also needs to synchronize its workforce planning efforts with its competitive sourcing efforts.
- *Competitive sourcing* – Focus staffing on the core mission of the Service – Wildlife Conservation. The need for the Service to outsource its administrative work is growing; this work prevents staff from focusing on Partnership Development and other mission-related tasks. However, as the Service becomes more reliant on contractors, states and other partners to accomplish our mission, it will become increasingly important to have skilled contracting officers and program managers.

4) Ecological and environmental changes and resource stresses will require continual monitoring and an increased emphasis on new technologies and specialization.

- *Invasive species & wildlife disease* – The Service will need to be able to address the public on issues regarding the increasing list of invasive and injurious species. Wildlife disease is a growing concern that not only affects healthy habitats and wildlife, but could also be

potentially dangerous to humans. This would greatly impact the public's perception of the Service and of wildlife in general.

- *Climate change and habitat degradation* – Climate changes are degrading, fragmenting and destroying wildlife, plants and their habitats. Evidence increasingly demonstrates that global warming and climate changes affect wildlife populations and species distribution. At the same time, there is public pressure to use habitats for recreational activity. Habitats need to be actively managed for restoration. These changes may require a reassessment of current wildlife management strategies and hunting regulatory changes. Biological monitoring will become increasingly important to identify areas under such stress.
- *Water quantity/quality* - Competition for available water is becoming a more critical issue with regard to maintaining healthy habitats for fish and wildlife.
- *Rapid development in and around refuges* – Urban/suburban areas are expanding to refuges and other protected areas, resulting in habitat loss/fragmentation, threats of disease, wildfire, invasive species introduction, and an increasing demand for support.

5) In order to be successful in the future, we need to shape the Service's workforce in an intentional way.

- *Understanding workforce planning* – The service as a whole should promote an understanding of workforce planning and what it can do for the organization. Workforce planning does not simply refer to 'downsizing,' but also encompasses workforce efforts including retraining, recruitment initiatives, etc.
- *Workforce diversity* – Downsizing the Service could potentially reduce its current workforce diversity efforts. The changing demographics of the U.S. population require the Service to significantly expand the cultural diversity of its employees to better reflect and represent the nation's populace.
- *Downsizing* – The Service must identify where there *is* a need to downsize and then create vacancies that can be filled by employees with new skill sets. To avoid being too 'top-heavy' in its organizational structure, the Service might consider eliminating more unnecessary senior positions as opposed to low grade jobs that have high cost/benefit ratios to the core mission of the organization. We need to use management authorities such as Reductions in Force (RIF), Voluntary Early Retirement (VERA) and Voluntary Separation Incentive Payments (VSIP) where necessary.
- *Re-training and leadership development* – With the declining budget, it is important that the Service maintains its ability to retrain existing staff and to focus on leadership development so that recruitment into managerial ranks will be easily achieved. We also need to ensure that our staff has the right skill sets to address new conservation challenges in the next decade. An increased reliance upon partners for accomplishment of Service objectives will require a workforce with skills in coalition building, negotiation, collaboration and leadership.
- *Specialization of the workforce* – Multi-disciplinary work is fading out; the world is becoming more scientific and the expertise more and more focused. We need more scientists with specialty expertise and advanced degrees. The changing ways that society values and uses wildlife (e.g., urbanization and fragmentation of landscape) requires a workforce with more specialized skills rather than general biologists.

- *Management authorities and workplace flexibilities* – In order to recruit and retain the best and brightest, the Service needs to explore creative ways to attract and develop employees. Examples include Quick Hire Authority, SCEP intern program, formal mentoring programs, job sharing and flexible working hours. We should consider more competitive, family friendly workplace policies and practices.

6) Widespread change has made it necessary to refine the Service’s business model and review assumptions about our core functions, structure and values.

- *Increase in partnerships and collaboration* – Ensure that efforts are integrated with other federal programs, States and Tribes, and conservation entities. Pursue opportunities and resource for collaboration and networking with other agencies, communities, and individuals whose interests are directed to our same mission.
- *Shifting resource management* – The Service should encourage and reward employees who reach across program and agency boundaries to identify solutions to emerging problems. The Director needs to insist upon cross-program focal areas and species priorities being set by each RD, and a dedication to furthering cross-program achievement. We need to work with Congress to consolidate our programs and sub-activities. There is a lot of complementary expertise that could be better used to address the mission of the Service.
- *Re-examining and resetting priorities* – We need to embrace resetting our priorities at every management level rather than trying to hold onto everything, protecting programmatic turf, and gaming for funding increases. We need to identify what we are *not* going to do in the resource programs and in administration. We need to become more strategy focused rather than budget driven. Service Programs need to be better integrated to identify and focus on mutual priorities and to capitalize on leveraging resources (funding, staff, data, etc.) to address these priorities.
- *Organization culture change* – Need people who can think in multi-dimensions to achieve solutions, which often require a certain level of risk. Need to recruit and/or train with an emphasis on risk management. There needs to be strong leadership from the highest levels of the organization in order to make difficult decisions to drive substantive change.

APPENDIX D: MODIFIED WORKSHOP AGENDA

Day One – Tuesday, February 28, 8:00am – 5:30pm

Time	Topic & Speaker	Location
8:00	Welcome & Opening Remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. P. Lynn Scarlett, Deputy Secretary of the Interior • Mr. H. Dale Hall, Director, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service • Ms. Debbie Kolen, Division of Human Resources, FWS 	Auditorium
9:15	Keynote: Some Thoughts on Our Changing World <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Richard Louv, author of <i>Last Child in the Woods: Saving Our Children From Nature-Deficit Disorder</i> 	Auditorium
10:15	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
10:30	Keynote: Conservation Issues Across Borders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. John Baughman, Executive Vice President, International Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies (IAFWA) 	Auditorium
11:15	Fish & Wildlife Service Resource Conservation Issues <p><i>Facilitated by Mr. Dan Ashe, Science Advisor to the Director, FWS</i></p> <p><i>The Future Challenge of Global Climate Change</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Larry Schweiger, President & CEO, National Wildlife Federation <p><i>National Ecological Assessment Team (NEAT) Initiative</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Craig Czarnecki, Project Leader East Lansing, Michigan Fish & Wildlife Office • Mr. Clint Riley, Chief, Grants Branch Office of Migratory Bird Management 	Auditorium
12:15	<i>Lunch Break</i>	Café
12:45	Luncheon Topic: Workforce Issues – Summary of Input <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Lisa Sper, Consultant, Federal Management Partners 	Café

Time	Topic & Speaker	Location
1:30	Instructions for Breakout Sessions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Debbie Kolen, Division of Human Resources, FWS 	Café
2:00	Breakout Sessions: Discussion of Issues by Program	
4:45	Closeout of Breakout Sessions & Day One	Auditorium
5:30	End of Day One	

Day Two – Wednesday, March 1, 8:00am – 5:00pm

Time	Topic & Speaker	Location
8:00	Welcome & Opening Remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Matt Hogan, Acting Assistant Secretary, Fish, Wildlife & Parks	Auditorium
8:30	Introduction to Workforce Planning at the Fish & Wildlife Service <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ms. Debbie Kolen, Division of Human Resources, FWS• Ms. Lisa Sper, Consultant, Federal Management Partners	Auditorium
9:25	Workforce Shaping Tools <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Todd Jones, National Conservation Training Center, FWS• Ms. Debbie Kolen, Division of Human Resources, FWS	Auditorium
10:10	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
10:25	Panel: Workforce Planning at the Fish & Wildlife Service <i>Moderated by Ms. Lisa Sper, Federal Management Partners</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Benito Perez, Deputy Chief, Office of Law Enforcement• Mr. James Kurth, Deputy Chief, National Wildlife Refuge System• Dr. Mamie Parker, Assistant Director for Fisheries & Habitat Conservation• Ms. Martha Balis-Larsen, Chief, Office of Program Support, Endangered Species	Auditorium
12:00	<i>Lunch Break</i>	Café
12:30	Luncheon Keynote: Competitive Sourcing and High Performing Organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ms. Donna Kalvels, Director, Center for Competitive Sourcing Excellence, U.S. Department of the Interior	Café
1:45	Breakout Sessions: Envisioning the Future FWS Workforce	
4:30	Closeout of Breakout Sessions & Day Two	Auditorium
5:00	End of Day Two	

Day Three – Thursday, March 2, 8:15am – 3:15pm

Time	Topic & Speaker	Location
8:15	Overview of Breakout Group Discussions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Debbie Kolen, Division of Human Resources, FWS • Representatives from Cross-program Breakout Groups 	Auditorium
9:00	Welcome Address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Marshall Jones, Deputy Director, Fish & Wildlife Service 	Auditorium
9:30	<i>Break – Travel to Breakout Rooms</i>	
9:45	Breakout Sessions: Action Planning & Recommendations	
12:00	<i>Lunch Break</i>	
1:30	Director’s Call to Action Questions & Answers with Dale Hall	Auditorium
3:00	Video: Celebrating the Fish & Wildlife Service	Auditorium
3:15	End of Conference	

APPENDIX E: COMPILATION OF BREAKOUT SESSION NOTES DAY ONE

Name of Session: Discussion of Strategic Issues

Name of Program: Cross-cutting Functions

Name of Facilitator: Erica Carter

Name of Recorder: Mike Camburn

Prioritized List of Strategic Issues Affecting the Program - (3-5 years) and Long-term (5-10 years)	Near-term
--	------------------

The following prioritized issues were deemed short term, unless otherwise indicated:

- 1) Culture change must be planned with adequate leadership and explanation.
 - Lack of directorate support in changes. Committees for change grow, which costs money; nothing ever changes, but always have initiatives for change.
 - Cannot make ad hoc changes without strategic plan; need implementation accountability for change that is consistent across regions;
 - Leadership needs to be more involved with operational oversight, decision-making, and implementation. Senior lead direct, deputy director are so consumed with issues that they ignore operational/organizational management; regional issues never addressed until they become major for the directors to see.

- 2) Service will have to get smaller, cheaper, and smarter.
 - Fewer Regional Offices, function of money and base erosion; administratively we can deliver services from fewer places, so that the region/field share services; we should have less than 8/9 Regional Offices (but not one office); we should have fewer Regional Offices (3-4);
 - *Why?* Less money than before to spread around; traditionally we have cut a little from each program and function, but we should start cutting offices and functions; *smarter is essential in this comment*; when you cut a little of everything, everything gets gradually worse, but we need to focus on what is essential and cut less essential;
 - Driven by OPM and applicable to many agencies; should be done from the inside, should not be co-mixed, if anyone thinks we will get better service for less money they are crazy; every consolidation fails, because there is no planning, it is just done; incremental cuts will not get us there.

- 3) Coordinate with programs to determine admin needs, and best way to deliver

- 4) Growing demand for IT services to adjust to current/emerging technology

- Must catch up to internet age (from where we came from in working from the back of a truck); need to allocate funding to support growth in IT services; feel like a victim of decisions made about IT changes that are forced upon us by DOI; e.g., Smart cards; decisions about IT are coming from above (e.g., OMB, Legislative Mandate).

5) Selection and Training for Managers (Long-Term)

- Most of the service is identified as biologists, but we (i.e., admins) are really managers. Service needs to develop business skills as managers; less than 50% of Service employees are biologists, and there seems to be a glass ceiling separating non-biologists from bios; Service needs to better value non-biologists in creating managers; not all managers with technical biology background are suitable for management positions.

The following issues were ranked as a Lower Priority (1 vote):

- 6) Competitive sourcing - Administrative positions are an easy target; bio/tech & fish people (but plan was canceled); FWS approach has been dysfunctional, must be more strategic to determine own fate; we are given a target of number of bodies; if FWS takes charge and thinks strategically, we might not be stuck doing what we do not want to do
- 7) Budget reductions – With limited resources, I need to know where to get biggest bang for buck
- 8) Unfunded Mandates by OMB, DOI, and Wash office (e.g., Smartcard)
- 9) Indexing – Mechanism for better funding admin functions needed in future; need to improve implementation of indexing, it needs to be institutionalized
- 10) Comprehensive analysis of Region 9 (Washington Office) – Regions were evaluated extensively, but not the Wash office; the overarching issue is money and Washington has the most control of the money; should be an analysis of organizational structure, functions, staffing, planning; programs should be evaluated at Washington Office as well as regions; proper allocation of funding & staffing should be evaluated (e.g., Base reallocation team activities)
- 11) Consistency of communication, structure, policies, work processes, and position requirements between Regions/Offices – We need the same message in the same way between regions for IT and other programs; *but we have resisted a one size fits all paradigm; some see individuality in service as an asset, but it is an Achilles heel; biologists in different places are treated differently and functions are not interchangeable as they should be; basically we do the same things and we need to start to do things in the same way with the same titles*; issues supported by many in group; grants are done differently in diff places; whole service first concept is trying to get at more consistency; human factor can not be ignored in changing of processes, consolidation; we want to maintain the level of personal comfort that we currently have that could be threatened by change toward consistency
- 12) Diversify decision-making authority appropriately and hold decision-makers accountable so that each decision does not have to take up a lot of time & energy; now everything is decided by committee which is inefficient

The following issues received the lowest priority ranking (no votes):

- 13) Changing demographics of the Service and public (both short term and long term) -- The current demographics of the Service are not similar to future demographics of Service or population;

future population will be increasingly Hispanic & urban, how do we work with and serve them; urban people are not represented

- 14) Professionalism of Employees (long term) – Increase professionalism, continuing ed, training among ranks; we are seeing a lot of audit requirements which inspect us and keep us accountable which require more technical expertise; do we need BFOs to be MBAs?; we may need more training and continuing ed for admins, HR, procurement, IT; Service should reflect increasing educational requirements of public and other orgs
- 15) Misunderstanding of value of administrative functions
- 16) More diverse skill sets needed (long term) – We need to organize and deploy to capitalize on skill sets; we need more people with different skill sets who can help in multiple places
- 17) Influence external stakeholders in policy making to reflect service priorities – We should consider issues before they hit and strategically plan so that we can determine what systems are implemented instead of being victims of decisions made for us; if we do not plan, they will do it for us; we should take initiative
- 18) Need to increase financial accountability – Right now no one is held responsible for many financial issues, money spent, allocation; increasing financial accuracy is necessary to fulfill external drivers; external drivers impose a liability so that we must spend money to fulfill their requests
- 19) Facility/Asset Management – Must demonstrate that we are effectively managing facilities and that they are contributing to the mission
- 20) Ability to recruit and retain quality employees (long term) – Need competitive pay and benefits
- 21) Supporting mobility of employees (long term) – Cost of living in DC discourages interest in relocating to DC; expense of relocating prohibits mobile workforce
- 22) Paying attention to information collected in administrative systems, specifically accuracy and reliability – Required by OMB; focus has been on Admin, because every program has one; increased attention to accuracy of funds spent
- 23) Automating processes before assessing added value, need to assess results once automated – Initiatives should be implemented based on statistical analysis of cost savings; need to use better metrics, planning, benchmarking to decide how initiatives should be implemented

Summary of Core Program Values, Mission Changes, and Trade-offs.

1) Core Program Values:

- Customer Service; **especially at the field level**; provide effective and efficient service, with integrity to uphold standards; showing initiative
- Integrity and Ethics; compliance with governing policies/laws/regulations

- Efficiency; good business process, proper time, money spent
- Effectiveness; good process and have achieved mission to a high standard
- Consistency in service delivered
- Transparency to customer of rules and processes of Service; transparent on why decisions are made, what processes and governing policies are
- Feeling of cohesiveness as a team that contributes to the mission; "We are part of the conservation team"
- Technical/Business Expertise; performing job with professionalism
- Positive attitude; showing initiative; believe that customers needs can be met; do not respond with "No" to a customer request
- Communicate effectively; with co-workers, customers, public, other government agencies

2) Mission Changes:

- Mission should be the same: serving the missions of the Service
- Do not understand how it will change if we hold on to our core values; we need to increase a collaborative effort; a collaborative effort would not change process, just number of people working on a single procedure; procedure does not change
- Programs do not change mission, just the way work is done

Suggestions for how the Service could operate more efficiently & effectively.

1) Service will have to get smaller, cheaper, and smarter

- Fewer Regional Offices, function of money and base erosion; administratively we can deliver services from fewer places, so that the region/field share services; we should have less than 8/9 Regional Offices (but not one office); we should have fewer Regional Offices (3-4)
- *Why? Less money than before to spread around; traditionally we have cut a little from each program and function, but we should start cutting offices and functions; smarter is essential in this comment; when you cut a little of everything, everything gets gradually worse, but we need to focus on what is essential and cut less essential; driven by OPM and applicable to many agencies; should be done from the inside, should not be co-mixed, if anyone thinks we will get better service for less money, they are crazy; every consolidation fails, because there is no planning, it is just done; incremental cuts will not get us there*

2) Coordinate with programs to determine admin needs, and best way to deliver

3) Professionalism of Employees:

- Increase professionalism, continuing ed, training among ranks; we are seeing a lot of audit requirements which inspect us and keep us accountable which require more technical expertise; do we need BFOs to be MBAs?
- We may need more training and continuing ed for admins, HR, procurement, IT; Service should reflect increasing ed requirements of public and other orgs

4) More diverse skill sets needed

- We need to organize and deploy to capitalize on skill sets; we need more people with different skill sets who can help in multiple places

5) Selection and Training for Managers

- Most of the service is identified as biologists, but we (i.e., Admins) are really managers; Service needs to develop business skills as managers; less than 50% of service are biologists, and there seems to be a glass ceiling separating non-biologists from biologists
- Service needs to better value non-biologists in creating managers; Not all managers with technical bio background are suitable for mgmt positions

6) Consistency of communication, structure, policies, work processes, and position requirements between Regions/Offices

- We need the same message in the same way between regions for IT and other programs; *but we have resisted a one size fits all paradigm; some see individuality in service as an asset, but it is an Achilles heel; biologists in different places are treated differently and functions are not interchangeable as they should be; basically we do the same things and we need to start to do things in the same way with the same titles; issues supported by many in group; grants are done differently in different places; whole service first concept is trying to get at more consistency; human factor can not be ignored in changing of processes, consolidation; we want to maintain the level of personal comfort that we currently have that could be threatened by change toward consistency*

Name of Session: Discussion of Strategic Issues

Name of Program: External Affairs

Name of Facilitator: Dick Georgen

Name of Recorder: Kelly Cano

Prioritized List of Strategic Issues Affecting the Program - (3-5 years) and Long-term (5-10 years)	Near-term
--	------------------

1) *Strategic Communications*

- Communication is a core value that has to be front and center. We are vested in our programs and the American public does not care about that; they care about what we do for them. The Service needs to look beyond ‘the Service’ by framing ourselves in a way that is issue driven and not program or Service driven.

- EA needs to be able to communicate effectively with its technology focused constituency. While searching for new constituencies, we need to keep supporting our traditional constituencies because those are the groups that support our budget.
- Certain programs are not designed to handle big issues, and thus do not want to communicate those issues. We need to effectively communicate the key goals of each program.
- Need for a culture shift within the Service. We need to do more planning and communication. How are we going to act and communicate/rationalize our actions?
- Conduct an organization-wide workforce planning study for communications.

2) *Outreach*

- The Service needs to put outreach first, or the issues that have already been discussed during this workshop will continue to worsen. The Service needs to create a constituency for itself, rather than waiting for the public to evolve. We need to put people, young children especially, first.
- A major question should be “What do we want our outreach to accomplish?” What do we need our public to know and what do they need from us? What is the public looking for from us? These questions have not been answered in our strategic plan. We recognize the need for outreach, but not what it needs to achieve. We do outreach just because we are supposed to. We need to answer these questions so that our public is more in tune with our mission.

3) *Reprioritizing Resources*

- Put more dollars toward communications and make progress on long term goals. Why do we spend time/money on things like press releases, etc., instead of trying to reach new markets? We do not need to create new packages. We need to be more strategically focused – we are making decisions based on budget and there is no relation to the objectives of the Service. We determine how we spend our time based on budget; we react rather than setting our own agenda and focusing on real issues.
- Congressional authority is driven by tax payers and anglers/hunters. There is a lot of authority that is program driven, that will retain how the service is currently structured. How can Congress help to change the Service’s focus?

4) *Leadership Development*

- The Service must provide career ladders in the field. There is only a small pool of people in External Affairs trying to integrate leadership development; having to replace a large group of people is a challenge when we have hiring restrictions. External Affairs must revamp how we hire; going through the hiring process is no fun and it is difficult to hire the people we need. Also, communications should be perceived as a leadership competency for which leaders should be held accountable.

- Getting people experience in D.C. is important, but getting people experience out in the field is equally important.

5) ***Movement Between Programs***

- We are antiquated as an organization with the way we address conservation. The biggest problem is not young staff (acquiring new, young staff is good for the organization), but that there is very little rotation within the organization (movement between programs, etc.) The more invested we are in our own jobs, the less we think as a service. Thus, how can we expect to address issues like global warming which are beyond anything we have ever thought of before? We need new ways of thinking in terms of how we deliver conservation.

6) ***Political Micromanagement***

- Of what we say and how/if we say it (i.e., words like ‘climate change’).

7) ***Cutting Programs***

- When it comes to making various cuts within programs, at what point does the agency go into such a decline that they cannot stop it? What are the effects down the road of cutting these programs?

<p>Summary of Core Program Values, Mission Changes, and Trade-offs.</p>
--

1) Core Values:

- Strategy focused communications
 - Target audiences
 - Delivery (Internet, radio, TV, etc.)
- Serving as Strategic Communications Consultants
- External Affairs helps provide a morale boost to the agency by telling success stories and by providing opportunities for a sense of pride in what we do as an organization. External Affairs is behind the field 100%.

2) Mission Changes:

- *External Affairs*
 - Become increasingly strategic/proactive

- Grow and integrate the communications capacity throughout the Service
- Integrate communications into the process of policy development and decision-making
- Nationally consistent message development
- Emphasis on internal communications
- Utilizing latest technology
- *International Affairs*
 - More aggressively and proactively address emerging global issues

3) Trade Offs:

- Drop lower priority outreach efforts (reduce /eliminate non-controversial outreach packages on routine agency actions)
- Pass up on some good communications/outreach opportunities in order to stay focused on priorities
- Consolidate Native American grants program nationally within Federal Assistance
- External Affairs lose some program control to empower regions

Identification of cross-cutting or Service-wide issues.

All issues apply

Suggestions for how the Service could operate more efficiently & effectively.

- 1) Share web/graphics/TV/radio/production capacities
- 2) Electronic document management and record keeping
- 3) Standardize position descriptions
- 4) Classification needs to be consistent across regions
- 5) Standard operating procedures for communications
- 6) Consolidate grants management
- 7) Integrate communications training at the leadership level/provide opportunities inter-agency to identify and learn best practices
- 8) Identify strengths and shortcomings of the Service

Name of Session: Discussion of Strategic Issues

Name of Program: Ecological Services

Name of Facilitator: Sherean Miller

Name of Recorder: Jo Robinson

Prioritized List of Strategic Issues Affecting the Program - (3-5 years) and Long-term (5-10 years)	Near-term
--	------------------

Note: In almost all cases, the group felt that something ‘actionable’ needed to be done now and continued into the future; therefore most issues were both near-term and long-term.

1) Shaping the Workforce (Issue 5)

- NT not where we should be. GS-11 and above lose diversity.
- Cannot change by advertising 11s & 12s. Need to bring in at entry level (7/9). Making selections on merit limits us.

2) Declining/Flat Budgets (Issue 3)

- Space – need to collocate and we should own our space ES can work anywhere. Space increases reduce workforce. Can cancel lease with GSA, have people cost – not easy.
- Operate within regulatory framework (Endangered Species) still have things we have to do (section 7, etc). Expected time frames and workloads outstripping capability to do the work. Legal ramifications.
- Think globally about current regions. Politics and us resistant. Need all functions in all regions? Combine or close down regions more a political issue. Not always forcing change on the field. Cultural shift.
- Brings us back to need to work in partnerships, cross programs. Whether we make organizational changes or not, we need to focus (seat change) eliminate program identity. Identity should be with larger conservation community. Set priorities together.
- Need second coming of Earth Day. We lose budget battles when public does not know what we do.

3) Demographic Changes and Shifting Cultural Values (Issue 2)

- Already seeing shift in urbanization. Distant from stakeholder. Who are the people we are benefiting (future generations) what are the demographics. We do not have a clue who they are and how to relate to them.
- Ongoing into the future...generations coming up...no one changes unless forced to or becomes too painful to stay the same...selfish generation coming up. What’s in it for me?

- Our issues are eating us up. Send folks out to community on a regular basis. Most of our folks like to go out to schools/public events but cannot break away from the workload. Not as much of an issue as before (to the schools anyway).
- 75-80% of FWS are 'I's' [Introverts on Myers-Briggs scale] – [doing outreach] is not their preference. We need to make it easy for them to do it...training, tips, encourage, etc. (Better now)

4) Retirements and Other Attrition (Issue 1)

- New people adapt easier to change been dealing with it; support some of the new ideas about conservation. Thinking in landscape scale. Do not force through the keyhole of our way of thinking. Pass on institutional knowledge rather than thinking
- Leadership program – money to put people through the programs. Enough programs? Need to make sure that those who are approved for attendance are the highest caliber. Current leaders need to ensure best are sent forward. One cohort is not enough. Some in the program should not be there. R5 started own program (SUTL like) spending \$20,000 in own program. R3 spent \$15,000 for one ALDP participant. Need to balance quantity and quality. R6 does not have the backfill for the 11/12s. ES does not have a volunteer component to give back. More in refuges. Got to watch who bring back – newer thinking rather than stuck thinking.
- We have one track to get to higher grade-through leadership and management. Goal post advancement (13/14 non supervisory technical experts) rather than being put into leadership where their strengths are not, but go there due to advancement opportunity. e.g., science advisor...gets best people in leadership; best in technical
- Are we still in old model? Fill vacancies when people retire. How much latitude do we have in the short term...pay bands? Getting leaner need creative pay model. Have not fully capitalized on matching need and skills. Fundamental changes - what options. Cannot afford to, live longer, have kids later...will be around longer after they could retire.
- Need new leader approach that we currently do not have, in some leaders who will probably stay around longer. Shift in thinking. As long as we deliver money out by program will deal with the cross program issues. There is no incentive.
- Are we structured right? We will need to be forced to bring offices together...then look for the skills. Look at how do we deliver program, then address are the right people in the right place?
- Current performance plan does not allow for rating by peer...have I been reaching out to the other programs to work together? If those peers provide input to the performance appraisal. Break the vertical approach to performance. Incentive structure change.

5) Widespread Change (Issue 6)

- Need to change and rethink the Business Model. Also, need an attitude shift to go along with the thinking.

- Money management/fiscal management – approaching others for money - we do not like to go ask for help – not connected to business model. Different skill set – sales? We do not have a business model and resistance to having one. Some project leaders have gotten creative.

6) Ecological and Environmental Changes (Issue 4)

- Need more generalists – allows us to be more nimble. We already have a lot of specialists. Employees need to become more leaders/facilitators/grant writers. Funding out of salaries into ops so can contract what we need. Current: safe to put money into salaries. Cultural issue – I belong to this program. Need diversity of skills...we are specialized at every level. Not willing to shift from that program. Certified environmental specialist will sign off on projects (from DOI) forcing us to move to generalist.
- Need employees with people skills to build partnerships.

Summary of Core Program Values, Mission Changes, and Trade-offs.

1) Core Program Values:

If citizenry does not like what we are doing, we will not be doing it. Working at the pleasure of the people. Clear understanding of values (as stated in mission statement). Not sure all folks remember all pieces of the mission statement. Working for the benefit of the people, but making the decisions because I have studied it. “I’m taking care of America.” Need attitudinal change, not a mission change. (How we deliver the mission.) Mission does not need to change. How we go about achieving?

2) Mission Changes:

- Move away from regulatory to partnership (some shifting faster than others)
- Workload management – how many times product is reviewed
- Rather give up whole suites of activities rather than do all less than 100%
- Excessive control (this is a biggie) vs. shared achievements with partners

3) Trade Offs:

- Risk management - believe we have to tackle everything. Shift to landscape level, some fall off the table for the greater good. Trade off: Let go of opportunities to regulate.
- More strategic, less opportunistic
- Efficiency vs. being thorough. When do we call it quits? Need to move from excessive control to sharing achievements.
- Fewer people, less capacity to do regulatory work....people (FWS) focus to landscape focus
- Let others own stuff. Trust others data, contributions. Give up being the end all expert. Lose control; gain partners.

Identification of cross-cutting or Service-wide issues.

- 1) Cost of leasing space – co-locating
- 2) Common services – core which can serve multiple programs (GIS, Bus Services, HR) what do we all need, what do the programs need? Let programs do what they do best (One supervisor for Migratory Birds, Fish, Ecological Services personnel, inter-jurisdictional fisheries, Joint Ventures)
- 3) Mirror functions in DC as set up in regions
- 4) Budget is stove-piped.
- 5) ARDs meeting programmatically. Cross programs needs to start right here
- 6) Jumpstart – articulate/develop shared priorities together. Accountability.
- 7) Need to manage up. Hold AD/RD to the cross program approach. Competition for \$ for program now (Decade of competition overshadowing possibilities for cross program cooperation.) Have lost synergy. Protecting what money we get.

Suggestions for how the Service could operate more efficiently & effectively.

- 1) Cost of leasing space – co-locating offices will reduce costs
- 2) Common services – core which can serve multiple programs (GIS, Bus Services, HR) what do we all need, what do the programs need? Let programs do what they do best (one supervisor for Migratory Bird, Fish, Ecological Services personnel, inter-jurisdictional fisheries, Joint Ventures)
- 3) Restructure the field, region and Washington Office
- 4) Mirror functions in DC as set up in regions
- 5) Budget is stove-piped and needs to change in order for the Service to operate cross-functionally
- 6) ARDs meeting programmatically. Cross programs needs to start right here
- 7) Jumpstart – articulate/develop shared priorities together. Accountability.
- 8) Need to manage up. Hold AD/RD to the cross program approach. Competition for money for program now (Decade of competition overshadowing possibilities for cross program); have lost synergy. Protecting what money we get.
- 9) Focus on creating ‘one Ecological Service’---do not talk about Endangered Species and Habitat Conservation as two distinct programs any longer.
- 10) Step back and determine what FWS should look like. Then decide what programs you need and how they should be structured.

Name of Session: Discussion of Strategic Issues

Name of Program: Fisheries & Habitat Conservation

Name of Facilitator: Erin Baillie

Name of Recorder: Cathy Johnson

Prioritized List of Strategic Issues Affecting the Program - (3-5 years) and Long-term (5-10 years)	Near-term
--	------------------

- 1) Habitat Loss and Fragmentation (both near-term and long-term)
- 2) Need for greater integration of programs/expertise/capability (near-term)
- 3) Demographic changes, urbanization, shift in ethnicity of the public we are serving – different conservation values. (near-term with long term implications)
- 4) Functional Identity Crisis – need for program integration within Fisheries and Habitat Conservation (near-term)
- 5) Quality/Quantity of Water - there is a paradigm shift from species specific focus to a landscape/watershed focus. (both near-term and long-term)
- 6) Aging Workforce (leadership succession, age and experience gaps, loss of institutional knowledge, cultural differences) (near-term)
- 7) Budget (both near-term and long-term)
- 8) Information Technology (rapidly changing Technology - how do we keep up?) (near-term with long-term solutions)
- 9) Administrative burden (inefficient reporting to OPM, mandatory training etc.) (near-term)
- 10) Non-native species, including diseases (e.g., Avian Bird Flu, Whirling Disease, etc.) (near-term)

Summary of Core Program Values, Mission Changes, and Trade-offs.

- 1) Core Program Values:
 - Collaborative partnership approach
 - Sound scientific competencies - multidisciplinary capability
 - landscape/watershed based approaches
 - Adaptive management
 - Ability to monitor and assess populations and habitat status
 - aquatic habitat restoration
 - Invasive species
 - Accountability and transparency

2) Mission Changes:

- Greater integration of programs (culture change)
- Pick a geographical focus area - set goals/objectives and focus all program resources that one area
- Organization needs to be set up to support a focused approach - all efforts need to be set up to support the same goal (includes: rewards, budgets, planning etc...)

3) Trade Offs:

- Species that desperately need recovery actions to be fixed will be left out during the focus. Need to choose these recovery actions in consultation with state partners. There will be winners and losers.
- We will not be engaged in as many things, so that we will be doing ten things well, rather than 60 things that no one knows about.
- Major business change going from a more opportunistic approach to a strategic approach.

Identification of cross-cutting or Service-wide issues.

This group focused on agency wide issues from the beginning of the breakout session.

Suggestions for how the Service could operate more efficiently & effectively.

- 1) Need organized systems that support budget, planning, etc.
- 2) Share an information system (knowledge management)
- 3) Set goals across programs
- 4) Need a Service Plan (no longer a Fisheries plan)
- 5) Need a buffer from political overlay
- 6) Need a dedicated effort or focus on developing partnerships (external)
- 7) Change from stovepipe budgeting, align organization with the budget
- 8) Restructuring of offices service-wide. Right number of Regions, Look at adopting centers of Excellence
- 9) Re-look at how we communicate and any changes need to be well communicated
- 10) Shift focus to the field offices as a delivery point which may mean reducing Washington and Regional Offices
- 11) Flatten agency
- 12) Administrative support versus natural resource support is out of balance and needs to be adjusted
- 13) Co-locate field offices on Service owned properties.

Name of Session: Discussion of Strategic Issues

Name of Program: Migratory Birds and State Programs

Name of Facilitator: Joyce Hayes

Name of Recorder: Karen Lindsey

Note: It was decided that both programs (Migratory Birds, and State Programs) would be discussed together as one.

Prioritized List of Strategic Issues Affecting the Program - (3-5 years) and Long-term (5-10 years)	Near-term
--	------------------

1) Anticipated retirements among Migratory Bird staff.

- People tend to stay within the Migratory Bird program for long periods of time. Coming retirements will cause a loss of institutional knowledge. This is also apparent in the State Programs and NGOs. Both Migratory Birds and Federal Assistance programs are ‘small,’ so do not actively participate in programs like SCEP to bring in new personnel.
- New personnel tend to come in with widely varied backgrounds, and creating some internal cultural and demographic changes. This will create communication challenges.
- There is a need for ‘cross-pollination’ in training, assigning, and recruiting personnel.

2) Changes in stakeholder demand

- It was stated that stakeholder demand is stable in the near term (hunters and fishers). However, there was much disagreement. There was also concern for the subject of the ‘nature deficit’ that was discussed earlier in the day.
- There is a lack of understanding by the outdoor equipment industry as to what happens with the federal excise tax monies taken on the sale of their products. That needs to be communicated more efficiently. There is a concern that the FWS has become complacent as to the loss of the attention of young people in the natural world—stakeholders are shifting and declining.
- Loss of institutional knowledge will lead to a loss of the possibility of building partnerships.
- The FWS should not focus on managing for the status quo. It is important to manage for the changing cultures. It is not possible to bring the public back to traditional values. The drivers (i.e., customer base) for Migratory Bird management are changing from hunting use (harvest regulations) to things like habitat management, land use, wind towers, and disturbance.
- The responsibility for managing the resource for recreational values has always been with the FWS, but the dynamics and mechanisms are changing—i.e., moving from game species to all

species. This has created a highly increased demand for technical assistance. New customers, new issues, etc.

- All of this will have impacts on workforce planning, because changes in staffing expertise will be required.
- 3) There has been an erosion of support from other areas of the FWS for Migratory Birds.
 - Ecological Services used to provide support to the Migratory Birds program, but it has been said that ES is moving toward the support of the endangered species program. Refuges used to be used as a tool for Migratory Birds to accomplish goals and objectives, but they are also moving away from that (e.g., surveys and banding). Other programs have to prioritize and focus effort, staff, and funding. So, Migratory Birds needs to be clear and specific on the kinds of assistance they ask of other FWS programs.
 - States could be a source for future assistance (as opposed to ES and Refuges). Partnering with the states will be critical.
 - 4) Migratory Birds has not had the skill or technology to incorporate emerging priorities into the larger landscape design.
 - 5) “Let our people do their jobs.” Staff work time is being taken up with administrative activities. This burden needs to be lifted. Let people do what is stated in their position description.
 - 6) It was stated that Federal Assistance needs to get out of the biology business. Biological oversight of state programs is not as necessary as it used to be in the past. However, there is still a need for biological expertise and presence in the Federal Assistance program to be able to understand and communicate with the states. There is an emerging need to have financial auditing of programs.
 - 7) How is the FWS workforce deployed? E.g., Washington and Regional Offices vs. field stations.
 - 8) Emphasis on international conservation efforts—especially to the south.
 - 9) Emphasis on training and highlighting for changing competencies.
 - 10) Collaboratively work on biological planning across landscapes.

Summary of Core Program Values, Mission Changes, and Trade-offs.

- 1) Core Program Values:
 - Scientific expertise on Migratory Birds
 - Collaborative conservation with both internal external partners.

- Retain and enhance our capacity to provide leadership at landscape scales.
- Continued support for international treaties. Define priorities under this umbrella.
- Customer service.
- Consistent program implementation.
- Financial accountability for grants (Federal Aid), i.e., auditing state programs. Integrate NAWCA and Federal Aid grant monitoring efforts.
- Focus Migratory Birds permit program on permits that have a conservation value.
- User pay/user benefit.
- Extraordinarily low cost of public administration.
- Focus on trust resources.
- Value our employees, their expertise and their time.
- Shared commitment across all programs to working on trust resources.

Identification of cross-cutting or Service-wide issues.

All issues identified in question one above cut across programs and/or regions.

Budget restraints.

Suggestions for how the Service could operate more efficiently & effectively.

- 1) Improve performance metrics.
- 2) Consolidate grant programs or functions where it is more efficient and effective. Concern expressed that grant oversight might be taken from FWS, and that different grants are driven by different laws.
- 3) Specify conservation priorities and structure and deploy the workforce accordingly.
- 4) Review span of control. FWS organizational structure tends toward 'silo management.' Programs become more and more isolated and less cooperative. A hard look at FWS organizational structure may help address budget restraints, e.g., review administrative functions with a view toward consolidation and increased efficiency. HR program functions, shared positions, etc. There is a need to identify and monitor current and existing models of cross program collaboration with the idea of extending those models to all FWS programs and regions (Ivory-billed woodpecker projects; HAPET offices).

- 5) Increase cross-program collaboration, including co-funded positions.
- 6) Promote cross-program work toward obtaining funding appropriations for cooperating and related programs.
- 7) FWS cannot rely on individual influence (e.g., strong leaders of particular RDs), but there needs to be more of a systemic approach to meeting challenges and solving problems.
- 8) Directorate must recognize identified priorities and the existing models of cross-program collaboration.

Name of Session: Discussion of Strategic Issues

Name of Program: National Wildlife Refuge System

Name of Facilitator: Jason Smith

Name of Recorder: Liz Bellantoni

Prioritized List of Strategic Issues Affecting the Program - (3-5 years) and Long-term (5-10 years)	Near-term
--	------------------

Near-Term (3-5 Years):

- 1) Declining budgets and increasing expectations
- 2) Changing demographics
- 3) Avian flu
- 4) Urbanization
- 5) Public involvement and Aging workforce (tie)
- 6) Habitat/degradation
- 7) Invasive species and water quality/quantity and external pressures and internal pressures (tie)

Long-Term (5-10 Years):

- 1) Climate change
- 2) Urbanization
- 3) Changing demographics
- 4) Declining budgets and increasing expectations
- 5) Water quality/quantity
- 6) Avian flu and technology and aging workforce and risk management

Summary of Core Program Values, Mission Changes, and Trade-offs.

1) Core Program Values:

- NWRS Core Values are already stated in *Fulfilling the Promise* (see Promises document) for full list; e.g., uphold Leopold's land ethic; wildlife dependent uses are legitimate and appropriate uses; partnerships are essential; etc. Most importantly, Refuge System has a field-based focus. Given this focus, what then are we willing to give up?

Core program functions:

- Wildlife and habitat management

- Visitor and Community Services (incl. Big 6)
- Communications
- Facilities and Equipment Management
- Fire
- Refuge Law Enforcement
- Planning
- Realty
- Business Management and Administration
- Information Technology

We need to reaffirm what we as a System are about (in priority order):

- Protection of our existing land base is key. Taking care of what we have is a reflection of our priorities (acquisition cannot go away, but might slow down). Need to prioritize acquisition needs. In some cases, we may identify need, but acquisition might come much later).
- Manage our land base.
- Expand land base.
- All six priority public uses do not need to occur on all Refuges.

2) Trade Offs:

- Taking care of what we have/completing Refuges vs. proposing a lot of new Refuges to the System.
- Land acquisition is one of the most important things we do. What is the expectation? In many ways, acquiring more land (protecting land) is critical yet does not have to be fee title; protection can be through easements).
- Is it land that we should be buying, or is it water rights?
- Do not need to be of the mindset that we have to do it all by ourselves. Increased sharing of resources is needed. What about working closer with our federal partners? Need to be looking at ensuring protection of representative habitats across U.S. Work with partners (e.g., States) to protect viable habitats rather than FWS protecting these lands via fee title.
- Ability to protect our highest priority lands. Need to make choices, including divestiture of refuges that are not high priority lands.
- Put off infrastructure development in exchange for habitat protection

Identification of cross-cutting or Service-wide issues.

- Look at #2 and #3 from “Concepts Embraced by NWRS Leaders.”

- Need for Service Centers. Should be evaluated on how well they provide support (it is all about customer service; does not matter what program they work under). Service Centers established for mostly support functions (e.g., engineering, HR, IT, Realty, planning, Contracting & General Services).
- Consider co-locating offices. Do we need so many ES Field Offices?
- Delegation of more authority to field level (would not need to go to a Service Center if we gave more authority to the field). Perhaps we should establish just one Service Center in the middle of the country, yet pepper specialists around U.S.
- NEAT should be applied at lowest levels.

Suggestions for how the Service could operate more efficiently & effectively.

- 1) Look at current number of Regions. Deemphasize Regional oversight; deemphasize Washington policy and oversight
- 2) Geographic and Administrative Support
- 3) Provide incentives for efficiency (and not punishment)
- 4) Eliminate filter layers (e.g., budget process; external affairs); avoid duplication of work. Determine what adds value to our core mission (this is the filter that we should use).
- 5) We need to create a culture of customer service and accountability (to the field and public)
- 6) Partners program should be combined with Refuges in all Regions
- 7) WO has a specific role: primary purpose is policy formulation and budget (this function belongs in WO). Need to review WO role, as well as WO organization (all programs). Do we need a separate AD for e.g., International Affairs (\$5 million program; some NWRS divisions have a larger budget)
- 8) Better use of technology
- 9) How does the FWS move from a regulatory approach to a more partnership approach?
- 10) Need to delegate decision authority to the lowest organizational unit possible.
- 11) Need to be able to make tough decisions on a site-specific basis with regard to functions
- 12) Need to maximize utilization of equipment and create a culture of sharing

Name of Session: Discussion of Strategic Issues

Name of Program: Law Enforcement

Name of Facilitator: Craig Welch

Name of Recorder: Bill Ashforth

**Prioritized List of Strategic Issues Affecting the Program -
(3-5 years) and Long-term (5-10 years)**

Near-term

The following issues are all considered both near-term and long-term:

- 1) Budget
- 2) Lack of other program consultation and respect
- 3) Internal FWS cultural change to include LE proactively as a partner instead of reactively as a tool.
- 4) Bio Invaders (Law Enforcement list larger than just traditional ‘invasive species.’)
- 5) Hiring/Recruiting
- 6) Population pressures

Summary of Core Program Values, Mission Changes, and Trade-offs.

- 1) Core Program Values:
 - Core Program Values hard to articulate. They are implied in the LE Priorities document
 - Law Enforcement is ‘last line of defense’ – if we do not get them, they do harm
 - “Law without enforcement is merely advice” – Law Enforcement is the necessary teeth
- 2) Mission Changes:
 - Leverage our effectiveness through and with other programs
 - Better coordination/communications between individuals and other programs
 - Mission level integration of joint priorities.
 - Domestic vs. International enforcement may change if Service focus changes
 - Coordinating missions will have to include a budget/support component. No ‘lip-service’ coordination on Law Enforcement dollars only.

Identification of cross-cutting or Service-wide issues.

- 1) Law Enforcement is unaware of other program issues, just like they do not seek out our input (two-way street).
- 2) Scarcity mentality and turf mentality impeded cooperation. Trust is an issue.

Suggestions for how the Service could operate more efficiently & effectively.

- 1) Major initiatives should include a Law Enforcement Plan or Appendix. Help us avoid 'unfunded mandates.'
- 2) Include Law Enforcement in early stages of proposed legislation
- 3) Educate other programs about the Law Enforcement priorities, restrictions and requirements.
- 4) There is an intelligent way to shape laws and rules, to make rules more restrictive or enforceable, ways we can increase effectiveness of your program by including us as intelligent consultants instead of the 'yard dog' with a gun.

Name of Session: Discussion of Strategic Issues

Name of Group: Deputies Group

Facilitator: Lisa Sper

Prioritized List of Strategic Issues Affecting the Program - (3-5 years) and Long-term (5-10 years)	Near-term
--	------------------

The group did not prioritize the following issues, which are also all cross-cutting:

1) Succession management

- Need bench strength, career development plans, e.g., for Refuge Leader/project leader jobs. People do not always want to move to Regional Office from field in order to advance. We do not often talk about individual career development.
- Mobility - Set realistic expectations up front with new hires – need more formal career ladder that addresses mobility – how much relocation can we afford? Employees may be more willing to make sacrifices [i.e., relocation] if they can see where they are going with their career. Why can't we manage the moves? PCS – relocation policies, bonuses. Evaluate partnership placement – spouse employment.
- We currently have more technical leadership, not simple competency. Not everyone wants to be a manager. However, should not be using accretions of duty more than twice for one person.
- Project leaders already exist who can step up. As for knowledge transfer, there are three categories of knowledge – stuff I already know, which is dated; new stuff which I do not know as well as the newer, younger folks; and my experience base which is what would be lost. Our bench strength might be stronger than we think, because folks have different skill sets from what we had coming up through the ranks. Look at coming trends – we need to keep agency relevant. Need to get them there quicker, we need to fast-track people into leadership roles and remove some of the hoops they have to jump through. We should get more comfortable with new workplace trends, i.e., tele-work.

2) Leadership Development and Individual Development Plans

- 'Leading from behind' – We need to teach leadership to all GS-9s, 11s, etc. Start earlier than GS-12. Will take edge off. Look at private sector leadership development models – IBM. [NCTC is doing a benchmarking white paper on leadership development programs in the public and private sector.]
- The problem is we just say "I have one in my file" – but need to actually use IDPs to help set expectations. Need to tell what is expected, not treat as a process mechanism. Identify norms, standards and requirements. Ensure there is consistency and fidelity to principle and policy.

- Look at curriculum – when get leadership and supervisory training? Leadership competencies – what do you need at different stages of career and different organizational structures. Leadership competencies are the same regardless of function. Managers have been focused on technical competencies.
 - Need examples of other programs – does the Park Service have a management track and a technical track? They have a much flatter organization, no ARDs. The Forest Service has staff officers and line officers. The DoD has Master Consultants; they have a ‘goal post model’ [dual tracks] for applied scientists. What does ‘mastery’ look like?
 - How measure competencies? Through behaviors – measure of success, results-based. Private sector – senior managers have to include ‘development of employees’ in their performance plans.
 - Commitment to leadership development is good at the highest level, not sure about middle managers. Managing critical transitions – having to hit the ground running. What structured support to help new leaders succeed – not trial by fire.
 - How preserve knowledge when we lose seasoned employees, especially when dealing with the challenge of transfer of knowledge to people filling critical positions.
- 3) Delineation of structure/field stations. Form follows function. Flow of authority, policy, etc. Build from bottom up or top down. How to provide guidance on how to organize without telling how to manage program. Discern nature of field work and organize based on that. Collaboration – fidelity at project leader level.
- 4) We do not do well hiring at the entry level – want journeymen level biologists. SCEPs, diversity affected. Want to keep good people where they are cost of relocation. Set expectations with recruits – self select out. Supply line out of academia. Inter-disciplinary conservation biology. New biologists other than wildlife biology specialties.

<p>Summary of Core Program Values, Mission Changes, and Trade-offs.</p>
--

1) Core Program Values:

- Provide opportunity for future generations to connect – new segment of population – not only hunters and anglers.
- Ensure there is something there to connect to – fish, birds, land, etc. Maintain land base – welcome and orient.
- Not in isolation – other federal agencies – cannot be everything to everybody (e.g., city/local planners). Connections/corridors.
- Who will influence conservation in 25 years? Values conversation – exchange. Regulatory, or influence another way.

2) Mission Changes:

- Eco-kids – how to get kids on refuges, give them experiences. Broaden partnerships. Public message – grade school.
 - We cannot develop curriculum – we can make the trails, building, visitor services etc. – make sure available, welcome and orient the public.
 - Partner with others to come onto refuges with educational programs. Grant recipients? Asset is the land – someone has to drive them out there.
 - More active outreach – modules for teachers – use as location.
- If future of conservation influenced through people – kids – then need to orient that way.
- Baxter paper – purveyor of knowledge about landscape. Organization having influence of the landscape. Getting in front end of listing process. Legislative process. Lead/influence other organizations.

3) Trade Offs:

- What can we give up? We do not do well with that. Nobody wants to give anything up. Most significant shift was Fish Passage, Farm Act, biggest core value for Fisheries. Where should we focus on private lands? Some areas make more sense than others. Conservation reserve design. What are synergies?
- What can we realistically influence/control? Ecological Services is poised for change – hands on regulatory role – model of doing ESA work – provide info to have implemented by intended agencies – focus on goals – not method. Crash course.
- Lead from behind – just say no. NEPA DoD. Work together – look at regulatory program and landscape mgmt – pick a paradigm. See ES evolve – work with MBSP. Oversight and capability.
- Refuges have a hierarchy of mission requirements. When ES gets pushed, go back to process. Law Suits. Where is unifying purpose for ES? If projecting influence, need to build trust, build knowledge.
- Lots of things we do now that we could stop today. Migratory bird permits – annual permits for taxidermists could change to 5 years. Captive waterfowl – buying and selling permits. Religious permits for Native Americans.
- Permits = control, signify lack of trust. Hierarchy of influence. We need to shift from statute to Stature. Influence rather than control, persuasion rather than power.\

Identification of cross-cutting or Service-wide issues.

- 1) Culture change – resistance, lack of trust. Key off other agency biologists to do work – we influence guide and monitor success. EPA model – a quarter embrace the change, a quarter dig in their heels, half are not sure.

- 2) Power vs. influence. Create methods to do work rather than do work. How influence to do work willingly – not only the club. Collaboration – projecting influence. Establish performance based goals and metrics; let other agencies be accountable for meeting them.

Suggestions for how the Service could operate more efficiently & effectively.
--

- 1) Decreasing budgets/increasing efficiency, etc. Business centers/clustering to combine work. Warrant authority – if lose in the field (240 hrs. training and degree) and share the resource – do not all need warrant officers. Space reallocation. Look across agencies - personnel offices contracting offices is there away to consolidate in regions. Also consolidate new refuge offices. Flattening the organization – service centers – do we need eight delivery centers? Political implications. Long term transition – 20 years, hard to think beyond one year.
- 2) Culture of management is missing. Decision making – distill into action. Never accepted - protect from it, never strained in it. Matrix org – decentralized, makes it difficult to execute decisions. Come to D.C. for three years and will get out – but need to commit in order to advance. Disincentives, D.C., region, field – experiences or equivalent experience with another agency. Exception management gets in way, too many steps of approval/review agreed upon process, accountability.

APPENDIX F: COMPILATION OF BREAKOUT SESSION NOTES DAY TWO

Recommendations for Improving the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Fish and Wildlife Service Operations

A Summary of Themes from the Breakout Groups
March 2, 2006

Organizational

- **Washington Office:** Complete and report Washington Office organizational review, as was done by the Regional Offices (core staffing) to see if there are opportunities to transfer resources to the field. Reduce Washington Office staff and Division Chiefs; reduce number of ADs.
- **Regional Offices:** Reduce number of ARDs
- **Programs:**
 - Combine Migratory Birds with NWRS
 - Combine Fisheries, Ecological Services and Endangered Species
 - Move away from Program-based management
 - Centralize Federal Assistance out of the Washington Office
- **Business functions**
 - Consolidate ADs for BPHR, Business Operations, and IT
 - Create three Service Centers for administrative functions
 - Concept of 'zones offices' (abbreviated staff) to act as a conduit between Service Centers and field stations.

Customer service should be the administrative function's priority. As long as it is ethical and legal we should do what we can do with what we have. "I have rarely heard that things cannot be done from Admin."
 - Programs are supporting admin functions in Washington rather than vice versa
 - Need line authority so we have consistency in business operations
- **Reevaluate Regional structure:**
 - Reduce to three Regions
 - Eliminate Regions entirely
- Increase field responsibility and accountability (resulting in fewer management layers in Regional Offices)
- Consolidate the Grants Programs (processing) within the FWS to ensure consistency and legal accountabilities are being met
- **Co-location:** FWS offices should be co-located when possible and located on government owned land. Eliminate rent by locating offices on Service lands. Long Island ES and

NWRS co-located office is an example. It was emphasized that this would create a better 'face' to the American public.

- Evaluate the possibility of consolidating the 'Point of Delivery' for various services provided by the FWS. Establish FWS Field Offices as opposed to separate program offices.
- State-organized offices with one project leader overseeing the various programs.
- Consider moving National functions outside of the D.C./Arlington area
- Divest low-priority refuges and hatcheries that are not meeting the mission

Leadership and Succession Planning

- Improve our leadership development programs (need more slots in programs; also, look at ways we can do it more effectively [more in-depth than what we are currently doing]; clarify expectations; create leadership paths; improve WO experience [establish mentoring program, overlap with departing managers]. Also, start leadership training much earlier in employees' careers [target at mid-level]; be more selective in who we are promoting to senior leadership positions)
- Promote leadership and management skills (e.g., ALDP)
- Loss of leadership & knowledge due to attrition, specifically retirement
 - It might be worth moving to leadership with more diverse skills so that they can assist in more functional areas
 - We have been advised that we do not want generalists; we want specialists as our leaders
 - We need more interdisciplinary professionals (e.g., mediation skills, teamwork skills, technical ability and knowledge)
- Need a bio business manager who knows the technical side as well as manager skills
- Develop a technical track career ladder for senior level (example, GS14/15)
- Need to develop a succession plan to address the retirement of many GS14 & 15 leaders
- Look at vacancies more strategically: Projected levels of retirements - not necessarily a problem – this may be an opportunity
 - We need to be able to take advantage of vacancies to make organizational decisions and move people around. We have the opportunity to do this as a result of projected retirements.
 - Be open to bringing in leaders from the outside of the Service
 - Make better use of IPOs
 - Preservation of institutional knowledge is not necessarily a good thing. We need a balance between new ideas and old ideas.

Landscape Level Conservation Planning and Delivery

- Embrace landscape level conservation across all programs
- Ensure that all Regions have technical capabilities to plan at landscape levels
- Adopt more landscape level initiatives
- Change accountability to reward cross-program cooperation

- Leveraging/synergizing with programs of states, NGO partners and other Federal agencies.

Partnerships and Stakeholders

- Leverage other agency and NGO partners' programs – Farm Bill programs, EPA, State. Every Office should have a person who is doing that landscape level look.
- Focus on shared priorities - Capture and integrate existing information from all natural resource management entities. Do not try to reinvent the wheel. Look outside the service, and identify what the FWS's role is in supporting overall efforts to conserve natural resources. Include states, NGOs, academia, and others. E.g., conservation efforts within BCRs; area GS12 biologists to support more than one refuge; HAPET offices. (Director's Memo Bullet #1)
- We need to incorporate external stakeholders (e.g., public, partners, and other agencies) in our strategic direction decisions.
 - If we have public support for our direction than we can get a lot more support (e.g., funds from Congress)
 - We need to define where public would like us to go. We should get more input from the public we serve.
 - Our public used to be narrow, but it is now much more broad and vocal. We should protect wildlife the way the public wants it to be protected, not the way we think. We serve the American people and we need their input to determine our direction.
 - We should keep them involved in determining where our resources are focused.
- Serve more of a facilitation role – putting ourselves in a more central role in order to accomplish our core mission in collaboration with others, less staff involvement. For example, have other fed agencies write their own biological opinions, work within the state wildlife plan to achieve the goals of the mission.
- Consider priorities of a broad array of stakeholders. For example: The past Director liked hunting priorities more than fishing. Hunting population is declining. Should we really focus so much on hunting (valued by a vocal few), when the values of the public have evolved?

Human Resources, Training, and Selection

- Increase flexibility in position classification to meet future challenges, i.e., facilitators, negotiators, grant managers. At the same time, maintain our scientific expertise and specialization to meet our core mission. (e.g., law enforcement, visitor services, fire, etc.)
- Increase incentives for attracting individuals who are seeking second careers; also provide incentives for early retirement
- Improve management of Workman's Compensation Costs
- Need to look at skill building and competencies required of our future workforce (e.g., need to require communications training for our managers)
- Train/hire people with organizational management skills

- Identify the skills we need and hire the right people (e.g., database management). Use the vacancy as an opportunity – do not just backfill with the same type of person that just left
- Capacity building for communication skills, team work, negotiation, conflict resolution, facilitation, mediation, external awareness of others.
- Hiring Diverse Staff. – Latino and other populations. Different groups use/relate to resources differently. Caged bird cultures, what they eat, how they relate to the plants and animals will affect law enforcement, migratory birds, other programs.
- Target retirees as volunteers.
- Collaborative facilitation training – every project leader has some skill level in working with large, multi-agency groups. Experiential learning – hard to keep the knowledge unless a hands-on experience – should be included in the education.

Responses to Demographic Changes

- Need to increase awareness of conservation issues
 - Set priorities, figure out who the users are and target them
 - Establish what our resource priorities are, what the threats are and address the appropriate audiences.
 - Change employee demographics to reflect public demographics
 - Population is moving to urban areas and therefore we need to establish more of a presence in these areas – we cannot lose touch with them.
 - Need to ingrain conservation ethic in the next generation (increase hands on experiences – bring it to them)
 - This is a great area to leverage partnerships for all programs
 - Need to consider the public as part of our mission
 - Need conservation literacy
 - This is not just external affairs – it needs to become part of our mission
- Urbanization and its impact on FWS
- Solutions – urban refuges
 - Promote earth sciences
 - Integrate FWS into school curricula
 - Urban wildness in the city
 - Urban fisheries
 - Allow ES folks to be more active in urban/local planning
- Hiring Diverse Staff
- Influence School curricula
- Use and impact of resources by population will change
- Better outreach materials addressing changing cultural values

- Refuges focus on creating ‘experiences’ (interactive vice static)

Process, Planning

- Set a realistic timeline for implementation
 - Identify interim highest priority focus areas by June 2006
- Geographic priorities should drive FY07/08 budget decisions
- Revise strategic plan to be more geographically focused
 - ‘One Service, One Plan’
- Need shared (cross-program) GPRA goals that are tied to the trust resources.
- Service-wide performance metrics effort could be rolled out in FY08.
- Create incentives for ‘managers’ to ensure that GPRA goals are met across the board.
- Need to challenge the directorate and all FWS employees to identify ‘vision’/strategic goals/GPRA goals that are common and overlapping to all programs, and ways to leverage available resources to meet those goals. It was discussed that the FWS already has a set of common goals, and that some programs have stepped-down those goals within their programs. There is a concern that resources might be misused across programs (i.e., using resources of one program to meet the priority of another program).

Measurement

- We should create measures of success
 - We need to monitor if resources are spent in effective ways. Our efforts have a purpose, but we do not work to determine if the efforts are successful.
 - “We should not try to measure everything, because there are intangibles that can’t be measured.”
- We need metrics of accountability for program outputs and outcomes.
 - This would help to determine where to allocate resources and determine areas of priority.
 - Current measures are driven by OMB, PART, GPRA, and DOI on a program by program basis.
 - We need a Service-wide approach with cross-programmatic metrics to measure success.

Communication

- Develop a strategy to make the Service’s mission more relevant to the general public
- Enable the Service to better communicate the positive conservation messages about habitat protection and trust resources to both our traditional constituencies and new publics
- Ensure that consistent messages are transmitted to the public
- Make strategic use of existing infrastructure; provide support for regional teams for outreach, events, publications, training, etc., and empower these teams to do the work.

- Conduct internal assessments for outreach needs, region-wide coordination.
- Teach the people we have and recruit new people to collaborate both internally and externally.
- Improve ability of supervisors to communicate well; hold them accountable for communicating with their staff (coaching and teaching skill sets are needed), especially in regard to changes that need to occur within the agency; Provide in-reach to staff regarding change management, plus ensure all employees understand and know how to provide input concerning change management
- Provide strategic public affairs skills training and share best practices across programs.
- Develop and expand approaches and models that will improve outreach to youth (i.e., project wild, backyard wildlife, prairie wetland training center, Junior Duck Stamp) and all demographic groups.
- Communicate impact of global warming on trust resources
- Influence school curricula. Better education, change in our outreach materials, may add an increased pressure from loss of habitat to loss of species/take. May change our scientific pursuits as well.

Miscellaneous/Specific Recommendations

- Use standard facility designs across the FWS (Refuges and Fisheries) in construction programs [rather than paying for a new design each time]
- Consolidate grant programs to increase efficiency and consistency (e.g., tribal grants, section 6, coastal)
- Analyze opportunities and implement consistent policies, procedures, processes and practices across region. (e.g., the federal assistance joint policy task force, NWRS promises document)
- No longer supply personnel to the DOI at our cost (problem is that DOI will take it off the top)
- Do not hire any permanents on soft money that is short term funding.
- Maintain adequate discretionary funding ratio to support field operations (do not lock everything up in fixed costs) and delegate authority to field level for decision making.
- Law enforcement needs to be closer tied to the other programs. We have to be closer. This happens at the field level, but not at the regional level.
- Review delegation of authority to step decisions down to the lowest level
- Re-establish trust relationship between Washington and Regions
- Stop doing 404s – spend time and money and have not saved an acre – wetland permit under Corps of Engineers

APPENDIX G: COMPILATION OF BREAKOUT SESSION NOTES DAY THREE

Breakout Group #1

Facilitator: Erica Carter

Participants:

Doug Alcorn	Carolyn Bohan
Eric Alvarez	Hannibal Bolton
Bryan Arroyo	Laurie Brooks
Bob Ashworth	Paul Chang
Larry Bell	Dan Diggs
Robert Blohm	

Ways in which Workshop Output Can be Used to Move the Service Forward
--

1. Make sure metrics are consistent across programs/regions.
2. External forces pushing toward integration. We should fulfill requirements (e.g., OMB)
3. Integrate more with external partners.
 - Example - Wind power is a controversial issue (especially on West Coast/CNO). FWS should be involved in with the planning process and develop partnerships with wind power companies. LE, Migratory Birds, and ES should be involved.
 - Wind Power companies have come to us, but too late.
4. Make sure that if we are going to do something, we do it seriously. We need to identify people to serve on a Task Force that can spend a lot of time and energy to make sure it happens.
5. Acquire a decision making tool to determine if the projects (e.g., project wild) are accomplishing their goals with the most efficiency. We need a good tool to verify the effectiveness of projects and to determine if projects are not meeting goals so that we can decide what can be cut. We need to look at each initiative's success quantitatively. We cannot continue projects just because we have always done it in the past.
6. At the Directorate meeting, each AD should know everything that the other ADs are thinking so that they can collaborate on efforts and budget requests.
 - ADs need to coordinate more before entering into directorate meeting.
 - ADs need to act like a team during Directorate meetings and not compete for resources.
 - Each AD should look at overall goals and determine where their program can fit.

- ARDs/RDs are trained to compete with each other for resources. Each AD goes to the directorate meeting and champions his or her projects and the AD with the best presentation gets the funding. We need more cross-service thinking when presenting ideas to the directorate.
 - ARDS should meet to identify/brainstorm cross-program initiatives/activities to be provided to Directorate in its April meeting.
 - Directorate is forming IN & OUT groups to form ideas to bring to the April budget meeting. The IN Group is a team that looks at internal issues whereas the OUT Group is a team that looks at external issues. These members should be bringing cross-program initiatives to the meeting.
 - Presentations to the directorate should go beyond brainstormed ideas. We should present them with more comprehensive ideas for initiatives. We need more well-articulated ideas.
 - Develop Task Force to develop comprehensive strategies. Group should flesh out ideas to determine plan for efficiency efforts.
 - We need a detailed analysis of major initiatives
 - It might take more than one task force to flesh out all of the needs.
 - We are ready for ideas, but they need to be developed to determine specifics (e.g., time lines, funding).
7. Manage change/culture shift to institutionalize cross-program planning, work, etc.
- ARDs need to be trained to believe that cross-program initiatives and budget requests will be positive for their program.
 - We need to redirect efforts and funds. The result will be meeting goals in a shorter time period.
 - We have committed people and we need to explain that this redirection will benefit the Service.
 - We need to focus on payouts of the change/results of the program integration to sell the change.
 - Reward and recognize cross-program projects.
 - Positive feedback and messages that reinforce cross-program initiatives.
8. Filter cross-program effort down through the agency and to the field
- Encourage collaborative work.

- Inform employees that they are working hard, but they can not make a significant impact unless they work with other functions.
 - Working as a team should become a business practice.
 - Each Region probably has good examples of how programs coordinate, but it is not institutionalized.
9. Include Administration in the cross-program planning to determine where it can serve projects.
 10. Talk about cross-program budget initiative within our Regions.
 11. Leverage efficiencies to expand and improve services.
 - Do not fill vacancies. Use money on the mission of the Service to revive state/regions refuge, habitat, and endangered species.
 - We fall into the trap of, “we have a vacancy so we need to fill it.” We should look at priorities first which will drive staffing. We need to know what will get accomplished by filling vacancies. We should first think strategically about how position fits Service priorities.
 - We should not decide where the money should go until we have identified the end targets of the funds.
 - Budgets are primarily ‘people’ costs in a lot of cases and not Service delivery costs
 12. Quicken the timeline for Washington Office review
 - Determine staffing needs which will drive space requirements.
 - Right size the administrative staff.
 - Base number of staff on legitimate workload drivers. This will drive budget needs.
 13. Create cross-program FTE positions.
 - If two programs need the same function, then they can hire 1 FTE to split b/t the two programs.
 - Trust is a key issue to ensure that an initiative is working successfully for both programs
 - We should advertise vacancies with multiple disciplinary series (Ex. 401, 485 for Refuges).
 14. Provide opportunities for cross-training (on the job training) in programs.
 - Some employees know very little about what is happening in other programs.
 - Does not make you a generalist, it makes you better able to provide service.

- The more we co-locate and get together, the more we will coordinate and learn from each other.
15. Improve training
- Project leader training (at NCTC)
 - Incorporate interdisciplinary content to support cross-program focus.
 - Train for leadership from Day 1 of employment
 - Train on future competency needs (e.g., mediation, negotiation, communication, business mgmt skills, building partnerships)
 - Train Administrative Staff to:
 - Gain understanding of program needs and the function of those in the field so that they can better serve.
 - Gain customer service skills.
16. Develop career ladders for major careers across service
17. Acquire more hydrologists
18. Acquire centers of excellence/technical expert centers.
19. Analyze the impact of the cost increase of the lease on the Arlington office (Washington Office building).
- This is an opportunity for a cost efficiency analysis.
 - The initiative to analyze will be a great opportunity to show we are serious about analyzing cost efficiency.
20. Reduce the need for space (e.g., co-location, tele-work)
21. Address the loss of leadership & knowledge due to attrition (specifically retirement)
- Leader identification has historically been a process of choosing the best technical people, but they do not necessarily have the interpersonal skills needed to function as successful managers.
 - Need more senior leadership development
 - Change 'old' leadership development model
 - Keep requirement for breadth/depth of experience in Service.
 - There is less mobility in the workforce.

- People do not want to be as mobile.
 - Losing mobility decreases breadth of knowledge of Service wide issues.
 - Breadth of experience can be achieved through cross-program projects as opposed to moving geographically.
 - Now if you do not transfer to the Washington Office, then your advancement in the Service will be capped.
 - It is ok for advancement to require transferring to the Washington Office, because there are experiences in D.C. that can not be experienced anywhere else.
 - Can you get D.C.-like experiences elsewhere? We could create experiences outside of D.C. office that mirrors D.C. experience.
 - Shaping national policies requires working with Congress.
 - There is a benefit to the D.C. office to get people from the Regions/fields with new, fresh ideas
 - Should the DC experience competency be used for advancement?
 - Is there any other way to gain D.C. competency?
 - Transfer to D.C. office should be a round trip ticket to allow the person to return to the Region after a period of time if they want it.
 - There is an expectation that they will get moved back to the Region.
 - It is difficult to get best technical people in, so we do not always get the best to move to D.C. – does not necessarily get the cream of the crop.
 - There is a significant cost to move to D.C., so there is an expectation that there will be an automatic increase in pay grade whether they were successful in D.C. or not.
 - People should not be penalized for going to D.C. if they are not as successful. They should be able to return to previous position.
- Dual career tracks will allow for advancement as Technical experts or advancement in Management.
 - If moving up the career ladder requires entering into a management position, then tech experts will be forced to become managers even if they are not

Prioritized List of Next Steps

1. Co-location is easy to start on. It will save money, and we can measure the amount of money saved.
2. At the Directorate meeting, each AD should know everything that the other ADs are thinking so that they can collaborate on efforts and budget requests.
3. Ask five questions to determine value/priority of projects/initiatives in Migratory Birds and what work is going to be done:
 - Is it a mandate?
 - Is it in the MB strategic plan?
 - Is it a GPRA priority?
 - Is it a focal species?
 - Is it a MB program mgmt priority?
4. At the moment we have three types of efficiencies identified:
 - Low hanging fruit (initiatives that can be pursued first). Work in the field that we can personally make more efficient and will not require extensive planning.
 - Cost efficiencies
 - Service delivery efficiencies
5. Directorate needs to walk the talk and ensure funding process supports the cross-program message.
6. The Service-wide problem is that every program has its own priorities, but we do not know the Director's priorities.
 - Director has six priorities (comes out of the meeting with the International Association) that states and regions can work on:
 - These are his six highest priorities, but we need to know other priorities as well.
 - Are these six priorities the shared program priorities?
 - We should look at the overlap between programs and determine how the overlap covers Directorate priorities.
7. Directorate needs to develop Service-wide model to compare and consolidate program priorities.
8. We need a paradigm shift from the Directorate. It should meet with all programs to determine a unified budget.

9. Directorate needs to identify the top priorities for cross-program initiatives by FY '08 budget process.
10. Directorate should make a commitment to resolve the issues presented at the conference, and support initiatives to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the Service.

Breakout Group #2

Facilitator: Dick Georgen

Participants:

Jon Andrew	Nita Fuller
Kathi Bangert	James Gale
Tom Busiahn	Ken Grannemann
John Christian	Jim Greer
Jennifer Fowler-Probst	Julie Lyke

Prioritized List of Next Steps

1. Set Strategic Vision with guiding principles from the Directorate

Short term actions

- Develop a 'Conservation Constitution' that endorses and expands the 'Shaping Our Future' memo in order to establish a clear vision with guiding principles. Communicate consistently at all levels of the Service. Complete by April Directorate meeting.

Long term actions

- Institute a shared approach to Biological Planning, and identify priority geographic/focus areas (i.e., National Wildlife Refuges, Migratory Birds, Endangered Species, anadromous fish, and the integration of state wildlife action plans).
- While maintaining connections with traditional constituencies, develop a communication/education strategy to raise awareness of fish and wildlife values among urban and other nontraditional constituents and engage them in our mission.

2. Conduct Organizational Review

Short term actions

- Complete Washington Office administrative review by June 2006.
- Identify a team to consider all aspects of organizational review including business center approach for administrative services and organizational structure. Develop a report by August 2006.
- Utilize the Federal Assistance Coordination Team to develop a plan to consolidate grants by July 2006.
- As part of the current review of Washington Office space costs, evaluate the location of HQ office functions outside of the D.C. area. Consideration of the rightsizing of the Washington Office staff as part of this review.

- Assess cost savings of co-location of field offices on and off Service lands by September 2006.
- Develop Service-wide policy to maintain adequate discretionary funding ratio to support field operations.

Long term actions

- Implement recommendations of short term assessments.

3. Develop Workforce Plan

Short term actions

- Conduct a review of all existing workforce plans in the Service and apply to the development of a Service-wide workforce plan. Remaining Service programs will develop workforce plans by March 2007.

Long term actions

- Implement
- Build capacity for communication skills, team work, negotiation, conflict resolution, facilitation, mediation, external awareness of others.
- Develop a technical track career ladder for senior level (i.e., GS14/15)

Breakout Group #3

Facilitator: Sherean Miller

Participants:

Martha Balis-Larsen	Tom Healy
Mark Chase	Don Hultman
John Cornely	Alexandra Pitts
Jaime Geiger	LaVerne Smith

List of Disincentives

- The money saved in program bales out someone else. We reward less than efficient management and, instead, should reward the better managers.
- The money saved will be a target (money has to clearly go back to operational base).
- Too busy with own stuff to communicate across programs. If we were flat, we would be forced to consider cross communication and work (similar to the CNO model). Each part of the FWS has its own traditions and pride.
- A key point to emphasize is that achieving consensus is impractical. We should go for it with less than 100% support. There are guardians in each program.

A Message from the Group

The group as whole is willing to make big changes. However, it seems that the Directorate looking for little or few changes, per Dave Allen's comment about expecting one to two ideas. We would like to see some vision before the action. What are the little pieces adding up to?

We should give copies of our Power Point to the Directorate (all others, too) but specifically to the Directorate. Put all the ideas in their appropriate buckets and start to work on the things you can work in the near term. Create a timeline for each bucket.

ACTION PLAN FOR THE DIRECTORATE (BREAKOUT GROUP 3)

BIOLOGICAL/ECOLOGICAL		
<i>Action Items</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Timeframe</i>
1. Identify resource based geographic focal areas	Regional Directorate Teams	By June 2006
a. Develop agreed upon criteria for determining focal areas	Science Advisors prepare input for Director's Memo	Memo issued April 1, 2006
b. Develop resource based metrics and template for reporting resources outcomes	Science Advisors prepare input for Director's Memo	Memo issued April 1, 2006
2. Apply FY resources (\$ and people) to support Service assets in given focal areas		October 1, 2006
3. Develop and implement standard operating procedures Service wide for biological/ ecological issues	Cross Programmatic Team	Identify Team and Begin Now
4. Incorporate sound scientific practices in adaptive management procedures	Cross Programmatic Team	Identify Team and Begin Now
5. Identify process for prioritization of key biological activities (how do you decide what not to do)	Cross Programmatic Team	Identify Team and Begin Now
6. Apply adaptive management procedures for all programs	Cross Programmatic Team	Identify Team and Begin Now

BUSINESS PRACTICES		
<i>Action Items</i>	<i>Responsible Party</i>	<i>Timeframes</i>
1. Issue Director's memo on co-location/ complexing to RDs	Director	Memo issued by April 1, 2006
2. Develop/implement consolidated management practices and procedures for all grants	ADs	Implement in FY07
3. Remove disincentives for increasing efficiencies (keep \$ and/or FTE where efficiencies occur). Provide details via Director's Order.	Director	Order issued by Oct 1, 2006
4. RDs analyze and establish goals for the proper balance between salaries, fixed costs and discretionary operations for each sub activity	Director/RDs	Memo with definitions and common language issued by April 1, 2006 RDs complete analysis by July 1
5. Transfer designated signature authority to the lowest level possible (i.e., field)	AD	Begin in FY 07
6. Develop communications/ outreach plan for every major resource management action	Director	Memo on Outreach and Communication issued by June 2006
7. Develop and employ standard operating procedures for business practices		Begin now and ongoing

BUSINESS PRACTICES		
8. Identify and incorporate new competencies and skills into PDs/performance plans, crediting plans, etc. then standardize (refer to handouts for competencies)	AD, BPHR	Begin now and ongoing
9. Focus on customer service approach for HR, IT, Finance – be more enabling, not policing		Accountability via performance plans; begin now
10. Redefine IT as a tool rather than a program; balance IT costs against resource management accomplishment and whether the new technology is necessary to achieving the mission	AD, ITRM and RDs develop white paper for decision making	By Oct 1, 2006
11. Reduce duplicative databases and standardizing databases Service-wide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ensure that users can use databases effectively from remote locations b. Ensure that you only have to enter information in one database; No database should require you to report the same information as another 	ADs	Ongoing

Breakout Group #4

Facilitator: Erin Baillie

Participants:

Lynn DeLaughter	Greg Masson
Jeff Fleming	Chris Pease
Nancy Gloman	Terry Rabot
Gerry Jackson	Paul Rauch
Marge Kolar	Don Weathers
Mary Jane Lavin	

Opening Thoughts

- The designated group seemed to be a good idea. More involved in execution and not the direction.
- Do you need to know where your priorities are?
- We cannot do a strategic plan because we do not know where we are.
- We need a strategic plan we actually have a DOI strategic plan. We have a performance plan tied to the GPRA goals.
- It is not the one that is guided toward direction.
- We are today looking at tomorrow paradigm.
- We are feeling the urgency for the service to get their act together.
- Can we afford to take all that time like the Fisheries did with the Partnerships?
- Listing some actionable items that will start this. Done before on another topic but it did not go anywhere.
- How much risk taking is the Directorate prepared to take? RDs need to be tasked with developing focus areas.

Key Messages to Directorate

- Service needs to get smaller, cheaper, smarter
- “Just do it”
- Directorate needs to be decisive
- Leadership needs a statement of commitment
- Summarize workshop with goals/timelines/responsibilities identified

- Act on short-term suggestions right away /make decisions on long-term suggestions
- Keep momentum going & report back to employees continuously (everyone in service should see communication on this)
- There needs to be a commitment to transparency in the decision making process
- Look at doing some of these suggestions for FY '08 budget
- Make sure everyone understands the CNO model
- As a group, we have recommended things that can personally effect us and are very difficult, we hope the Directorate can do the same and make the tough decisions
- The recommended actions are based on the assumptions that we are doing less as a service (focused priorities)

<p>Prioritized List of Next Steps</p>
--

Short Term Actions:

1. Director to establish clear priorities for the Service (make the tough decisions).
2. RDs designate cross programmatic focus areas using a common criteria that is established by the Director (including both immediate & long term needs).
3. RDs allocate budget & expertise to support focus areas (no longer by program). Program management budgeting cannot continue.
4. Flatten organization of management structure of all regions (including region 9) with the purpose of getting resources and greater authorities closer to the field.
5. Begin to change the behavior & culture within the programs. Examples include: stop talking about programs at RDT, ARD & project leader meetings, start to coordinate meetings with another program.
6. Begin to implement incentives to work across programs. E.g., begin to hire and promote people that demonstrate that they can work across programs (make it a KSA in performance plans).
7. Restructure functions of Regional Offices. Program Functions should not have support functions embedded in them – establish services centers for administration & support (e.g., budget, finance, personnel, external affairs, outreach, contracting, engineering etc...) – this may be long-term.
8. Complete a review of the Washington Office & implement recommendations.
9. Use CNO model. Under CNO model some Regional Offices become CNO offices.
10. Use vacancies as a strategic opportunity to reorganize.

11. Move Washington Office out of Arlington, VA (lease is up) and think strategically about what to do with positions (NCTC may be an option). This may require a study. Reduce Service expenditures in D.C. area (user pay for the move – the cost should be borne by region 9).
12. Start using VERA/VSIP process – this forces position management. Establish an 80/20 rule to hold peoples feet to the fire. Only allow people to fill vacancies if they can show 80/20. Establish a goal of being 80/20 in five years.
13. Task regions to identify organizational options.
14. Increase delegation to RDs & ADs for recruitment, retention & relocation.
15. Give Entry level employees the opportunity to lead cross programmatic teams.
16. Director needs to give the authority to begin to use flexibilities for recruitment, relocation.

Medium to Long Term Actions:

1. Leadership & Succession Planning
 - Develop business management skills
 - Develop training on business management (e.g., change management)
 - Shift focus to promoting people based on a demonstration of leadership skills
 - Establish career paths for leadership development
 - Target entry level hiring
 - Establish proper selection criteria to move up. Establish rigorous qualification/ selection procedures for leadership positions
 - Establish more ways to get national level training (e.g., give people a 2yr position with a guaranteed spot back in the field
 - Assign people on details where they can develop policies (this would give them national experience without having to relocate to Washington)
 - Find ways to expose people to congressional operations.
 - Offer relocation bonuses to incentivize moves & cross programmatic training (attract superstars from industry, not just D.C.)
2. Cultural shift to performance based management (begin to measure results) - Establish Service Centers/Centers of Excellence & link the reduction of regions into this process.

Breakout Group #5

Facilitator: Joyce Hayes

Participants:

Richard Hannan	David Patte
Linda Kelsey	David Smith

Tony Leger
Rich McDonald
Chris McKay
Brian McManus

Dave Stout
Karen Sullivan
Mike Thabault

There is a need for recognizing things that the FWS should NOT do as well as recommended or desired actions. Concern for the FWS to not repeat mistakes made in years past when making changes. We need to identify the strengths and successes from the past, and learn from those. The team decided to discuss and develop a list of specific recommended actions for the Directorate that addresses the issues discussed during the first two breakout sessions. Discussion included the commitment of the Directorate to issues discussed this week. Also, the FWS needs to follow through on recommended actions.

Prioritized List of Next Steps

1. Recommend that a national cross-program and multi-level (i.e., Project Leaders, ARDs, Program Supervisors, WO) team be established to research opportunities and barriers and develop recommendations for not only removing barriers but to create incentives between programs to share priorities and resources. (Director's Memo, Bullet #2)
 - An essential component of this team will be input and involvement from the field.
 - Need to have buy-in from DOI if necessary (i.e., changing GPRA goals).
 - Team will identify the component changes that will need to be made as they apply to workforce planning.
 - Establish team by April 7, 2006 and draft report by July Directorate meeting.
2. Communication Plan and Roll Out for Implementing Action Items
 - Video conference with Director, Dave Allen, and at least three of Day Three's presenters.
 - Employee survey addressing recommended action items.
 - Organize and summarize and review employee response.
3. Streamline functions and consolidate offices: WO, Regional, and Field. Create management efficiencies in Field, Regional, and the Washington Offices, individually and across regions in order to facilitate the provision of available resources to on the ground fish and wildlife conservation. (Director's Memo, Bullet #3).
 - Establish teams to address/review the following with the intent of sending a fixed percentage of appropriated dollars to field-based operations:
 - a. Service Centers for Budget and Administration
 - b. WO Review Team

- Estimate metrics for work
 - a. Estimate target (maximum money/% to each organization level)
 - b. Determine/identify jobs/functions that can be done elsewhere
- Sub-program Review Team
 - a. Air Quality Branch
 - b. Program Consolidation Team
 - c. Evaluation Team
 - d. Regional Office Review Team
- Background discussion points:
 - a. Combine duplicative services across regions for more efficient operation: HR, CGS, Engineering, GIS. It was emphasized that duplicative services are not only limited to administrative functions or Regional Offices or WO, but can include other programs like Realty, ES, etc. Look across all programs to find duplicity and efficiency. Recommend that a formal look be taken at programs in the WO and Regional Offices to identify duplicate effort, and find ways to operate more efficiently. 25% of FWS employees are located in WO and ROs. This group felt this figure is too high.
 - b. Concept of ‘zones offices’ (abbreviated staff) to act as a conduit between Service Centers and field stations.
 - c. Consolidate the grants program (processing) within the FWS to ensure consistency and legal accountabilities are being met.
 - d. Evaluate the possibility of consolidating the ‘Point of Delivery’ for various services provided by the FWS. Establish FWS Field Offices as opposed to separate ES and Fisheries Offices.
 - e. Determine what functions really need to be located in close proximity to DC (e.g., Congressional Affairs).
 - f. Determine what does not need to be near DC, and where does it need to be.
- 4. All FWS offices (including WO, ROs, and FOs) should be co-located when possible and located on government owned land. Eliminate rent by use of service-owned facilities within 15 years.
 - Issue Director’s Order establishing co-location processes, targets, and requirements by April 15, 2006.
 - Utilize service construction budget beginning in 2008 to construct consolidated offices on service lands.
 - Utilize consistent design standards developed by FWS for building design.

- Co-located programs will share expenses and maintenance.
 - Rent savings stays with the programs.
 - Any new proposed construction project needs to be evaluated for consolidation potential.
 - Eliminate self-imposed caps on SAMMS program.
 - Establish an evaluation process.
 - First priority should be currently FWS-owned lands.
 - Design new construction to integrate all programs (e.g., shared space).
 - Task Regions with creating a database that incorporates what facilities are needed by date specified in Director's Order.
5. Use good communication to work more cooperatively with others. Teach the people we have and recruit new people to collaborate both internally and externally.
- Require a communication element in the entry level required training (Foundations, Academies, and ES Basic Training).
 - Incorporate communication, collaboration, and partnership training into the Project Leader's Academy.
 - Immediate Action: Add communication training into the 2007 Individual Development Plan for every employee, and encourage use of currently available training at NCTC. Focus on completion of at least one course in the first two years of employment.
 - Share existing training modules, case studies, and infrastructure (i.e., revitalized outreach teams) locally developed in regions via Regional External Affairs offices.
 - Promotion within the FWS will require demonstrated good communication skills.
 - Create within External Affairs a rotating detail program whereby people from other programs would serve a detail in an EA office. As External Affairs vacancies come open, temporarily fill them with detailees from other programs on a rotating basis.
 - Create an External Affairs sub activity by the FY08 budget.
6. Parking Lot Items: Release Administrative Survey

Breakout Group #6

Facilitator: Jason Smith

Participants:

Rick Coleman	Rick Sayers
Sherry Morgan	Mike Stempel
Gary Mowad	Chris Tollefson
Bud Oliveira	Noreen Walsh
Jackie Parrish	Stephanie Weagley
Allyson Rowell	

Suggestion on how to proceed: Consider beginning with the end in mind (articulate our desired state). It is particularly important that we do this given that we need to bring our employees along as we implement change.

Desired State of the Future Fish and Wildlife Service

We recognize the time is right for change, and we want to define for ourselves and our employees what we want to be the end result of that change. We agree that it is important to begin with the end in mind. We suggest that the following narrative be adopted by the Directorate as a consistent message that all managers can use to share WHY WE ARE CHANGING with our employees.

We want the FWS to be more:

Focused so that our efforts are not diluted;
Strategic, such that we are making conscious decisions about where and how to use our funding and people to accomplish specific goals across programs;
Lean in our organizational structure so that we can put more resources to on-the-ground mission accomplishments;
Efficient in our operations and our business practices so that we can put more resources to on the ground mission accomplishments;
Integrated and united with one identity that is relevant to the American public; so that in the end we are **more effective** in accomplishing our mission on-the-ground.

Product at the end of this session: a list of recommended actions that achieves our desired state.

Proposed action plan and model for FWS strategic and workforce planning:

1. Identify program priorities →
2. Identify core FWS priorities from program priorities →
3. Determine how the agency needs to be organized →
4. Identify what the workforce needs to be and do

List of recommended actions to achieve our desired end state

Prioritize and become a more focused and more strategic organization so that our efforts are not diluted:

1. **Reevaluate Program Priorities:** Conduct a program by program assessment of functions to determine our highest priorities and by implication those functions which we are no longer able to pursue due to our fiscal constraints. We recommend an analysis conducted in-house, not contracted out. We recommend that the assessment be completed very quickly. The first step is that all existing programs conduct this analysis within their program. The analysis must be focused on what we want to become, not what we are now (gap analysis).
2. **Develop *One-Service* Priorities:** Then, those results need to be brought to the Directorate for amalgamation. We should involve our stakeholders and the American people to determine final priorities. In the end all programs must have clearly defined objectives, roles, and responsibilities.
3. **Become a leaner organization:** We need to approach this from clean slate and have no preconceived notions when we evaluate our current organizational structure. The best organization will involve some change; we recognize that change will be painful.

In determining the best way to organize, we should:

- Strive to push as much authority and responsibility to the field level as possible
 - Strive to limit the size and the number of upper management layers
 - Institutionalize our emphasis on cross program integration by breaking down the program lines
4. **Become more efficient in our operations and business practices and having the right size and type of workforce:** Critical success factors should be a measure of our cross program work and cross program priorities should be reflected in our operational plan. Managers should be held accountable to the operation plan targets.
 - Consolidate all finance functions in fewer locations, not in each RO office.
 - Consolidate all Human Resource functions in fewer locations, not in each Regional Office.
 - Downsize as existing vacancies occur and create a pilot 'Center of Excellence' for Budget and Administration.
 - Complete and implement regional and national space reduction plan with the goal of eventually locating all/most Service offices on federal lands.
 - Managers must hire attitude; develop skills. Hold managers accountable for developing skills needed in this century (e.g., communication, negotiation, collaboration, information management.)
 - Improve and magnify the manner in which we develop leaders.
 - Develop a track for advancement for technical experts who are not supervisors.
 5. **Become more integrated and united and relevant to our public**

Breakout Group #7

Facilitator: Craig Welch

Participants:

Stuart Leon	Rick Schultz
Greg Siekaniek	Elliott Sutta
Stan Pruszenski	Wendy Weber
Herb Raffaele	Emily Jo Williams

Ways in Which Workshop Output can be Used Effectively to Move the Service Forward

1. There has to be a follow-on group interleaving these suggestions, so it is better for us to get all the ideas on the table, and develop them out. Taking them down to detail planning is not the best use of our time.
2. 'Design Charrette' – before you build the house, you need to have a long talk about what the purposes and sizes and numbers of the rooms that will be there. Do not commit to change for change's sake. Organizational change for change sake. Want to recapture yesterday's energy, and generate some more ideas and solutions.
3. Integration
4. Regional species of priority and geographic/habitat focus areas in a strategic manner
5. Area office concept
6. Delayer the management structure to provide consistent mgmt throughout all regions
7. Program line authority from Washington to the field
8. Partners priorities have to be included as well
9. How to manage strategically without 'have/have not' divisions
10. Integrate all planning staffs into a virtual team (re-org not necessary) so their efforts are coordinated and cooperative
11. That virtual team needs structure, support, capacity. Hire/assign to bring the right talents to those planning teams, and strategically select that talent.
12. Are we programmatically organized in the right manner? Subprograms are 'lumped' differently in different regions.
13. Re-look at the academies as tools that are contributing to the separation of programs
14. What mechanisms do we have to facilitate communication and collaboration across whatever programs we do have?

15. Start early in people's careers with opportunities and training that supports cross-training and collaboration
16. Regional leadership programs could be more cost effective if curricula were coordinated
17. Promote various levels of training for integration/collaboration
18. We tend to pigeonhole people into programs from early on
19. IDPs need to have (an support) cross-programmatic elements
20. Invest in people, no matter how tight the budget seems to be
21. Details and job-swaps, mentoring – we have some simple means to hand over jobs
22. Seconding/IPAs to partner institutions as a
23. Incentives and accountability for integration – if we mean it, reward it and institutionalize it – this is a place, with GPRA insistence – the Directorate should facilitate
24. Consider Cross-program Work Activity Guidance
25. Construct career-ladders that include cross-program elements/experience
26. Budget – shared budget development/initiatives. Joint Green Book workups
27. Declining budgets
 - Establish Base Budgets for all field stations/offices. Current system drives you to get more people to get more 'slush fund' discretion. Puts the onus on the field level supervisor to manage to a budget
 - Somehow start better accounting for the 'uncontrollables,' try to level the impacts.
 - People and space are major issues. For example, incentivize the field level manager to reduce space, give them the slush money directly.
 - Own our own space.
 - Extend the cost-causer pays concepts. Push the accountability and the decisions down the lowest feasible level.
28. Landscape Level solutions
 - International liaisons posted outside the US for trust resources coordination (native speakers in critical areas) International collaboration Might accomplish through partnerships
 - Create recognition in FWS that we are part of and international effort
 - Integrate trans-boundary conservation issues into all major FWS training programs

- Strengthen or help create Forums for cooperation across borders. Some exist , need others – Caribbean
- Consider the development of an International Wildlife Conservation Institute to address large landscape conservation issues.
- Expectation that staff and managers spend a certain percentage of their time away from the refuge or hatchery, working ‘beyond the boundaries’ (i.e., collaboratives).
- Another issue to work with partners and to lead from behind...
- Create incentives to put their service activities into a larger context. When I do this, my admin reports might be two-days late. Support me in saying no to some of the lesser-level administrative tasks.

‘King or Queen for a Day’ Exercise

1. Reduce size of WO and ROs – 3-5 year period with increased delegation of authority to ROs – program realignment.
2. Budgets – uncontrollables funded. RO and field stations core staffed and funded. Admin indexed to program funding increases.
3. No DOI/OMB initiatives without associated funds!
4. Enable service to conserve trust resources at landscape scaled through cultural shifts, cross programmatic planning and assessment capacity, and adequate field presence in all resource areas (migratory birds, fisheries, End Spec. and refuges) to implement or support appropriate conservation actions.
5. Reduce overhead – specifically WO costs
6. Work cross-programmatically to identify trust resources priorities that are focused and achievable.
7. Restructure offices service wide
 - WO all together
 - Number of regions, ARDs
 - Collocate field offices
8. Set goals across programs
9. Expand information support system that is shared among programs.
10. Cross program budgets, not *my* money, but *ours*

11. Integrate programs at field/project leader level (almost Area Managers but not that far)
12. Define FWS Core Mission(s) with priorities
13. Create line-staff organization from WO to field office for each program
14. Hold all program staff accountable for working in collaborative fashion with other programs and with partners.
15. Instill 'customer Service' focus throughout administrative branches of organization and those accountable for not doing it.
16. Create list of action items from workshop – divided into short and long-term efforts. Identify who will do and when will be completed.
17. Establish space plan for FWS to find cost savings and areas where co-locating will help further goals. Goal to own our own spaces in 15 years is a good one.
18. Require Managers (RD DRD, ARD Chiefs, PLs, etc.) to have specific cross-program integration in performance plans with shared budget initiatives and GRPA goals and WAGs.
19. Create more flexibility to allow integrated/landscape approaches
 - collapse # programs and sub-activities
 - designate resources at every level
20. Decide on more consistent approaches and have all D'T members implement them, All ARDs, all PLs
21. Reduce ADs and SES at WO levels; combine BPHR& business ops; combine ESA and HC to mirror field, combine MB and NWR; combine IT and EA
22. Lead by example – Restructure the Directorate to demonstrate efficiencies that eventually transfer to the field. Fewer RDs, AD, DRDs, WO/RO staff with savings directed towards field.
23. No support reprogramming at WO level
24. Support field offices with all programs housed together and a common supervisor
25. Developing an environmental ethic (i.e., pride in our wildlife) throughout all segments of our society. Especially with formal education mechanisms.
26. Second a minimum percentage of FWS staff to strengthen partnerships. Be sure to include lower level education institutions.
27. Develop a broad, expanded approach to landscape conservation, particularly ecosystems and international/global issues.

<p>Recommended Next Steps for the Directorate</p>
--

1. Form some teams to work on this, combination of paid professionals and some full-time assigned FWS people. Has to happen quickly to take advantage of Dale's two-year window.

2. Directorate should take all the recommendations, sort into low-hanging fruit, the near and long term, and ASSIGN THEM TO PEOPLE WITH DEADLINES, TARGETS. Some of this process can start in the Regions without waiting. Finding those limited number of items/areas where we are going to excel, fall on our swords.
3. Need a plan or a vision that is long-term and that will span Directors and that ultimately the whole service buys into. Shared with our partners as well. Perhaps a Task Force task.
4. Need to have that plan reviewed, input from, developed with the general public at large, people not traditionally seen as our partners. A lot of this needs to be driven by Service people. Process, structure can be contractors, but content and ownership and direction need to come from FWS folks.
5. Need to share the products of this conference with the workforce, even prepare a special report intended for the 'rest of the Service' not part of this conference, who are watching and know we did this.
6. Need a common message from the Directorate, defusing the rumor mill and emphasizing the process we are still going through. The raw outputs they may see are not the 'decisions of the workshop.'
7. First task of this task force is to make sense and structure of all the input items, finding the target audiences, and getting the inputs of affected stakeholders, and their help in selecting which of the ideas are the most important or most implementable.
8. Balance the need for input with the need for and effectiveness of expediency and direct action by the Director/Directorate. All of this is 'pre-decisional' to some Service-wide product, or Plan, so we can "begin with the end in mind." If we can articulate the philosophies, values, practices, they can start to guide more immediate action at the Regional level.
9. Three phase plan – low hanging fruit, internal and FWS-controlled actions, and a longer-range, more universal effort that produces a plan that has input and review. First two phases can be accomplished within Dale's tenure. Directorate has to sort out the items and ideas into categories and assign them to groups or teams.
10. Stress the need for a permanent group to shepherd this entire evolution, cannot be left to part-time or highly-rotational staffs.
11. Learn and do not repeat the PARD/GARD implementation errors.
12. Point out that our changes line up nicely with Bob Lamb's 'capacity building' approach to the 4-C's implementation. Have a strategy about our strategy.
13. Balance between Regional flexibility and adherence/obedience to business models, policies and incentives/accountability

Breakout Group #8

Facilitator: Lisa Sper

Participants:

Cynthia Dohner	Pam Matthes
Gary Edwards	Hope Mentore-Smith
Christine Eustis	Benito Perez
Bill Knapp	James Slack
Jim Kurth	Dave Wesley

Ideas for Moving Forward with Shaping the Future of the Service

Proposed Vision:

Statute to Stature: Go from a history of power and control to [a focus on] influence, collaboration and voluntary compliance; to achieve strategic, landscape level conservation, stewardship and protection. This will be done through cross-program coordination, inter-regional cooperation and external partnerships.

If we choose this vision, we need to provide ‘sense-making’ of what this means. Need to define each of the terms. We need to be clear so there are no misunderstandings (e.g., analogy of using velvet hammer instead of sledge hammer).

Options for cross-program coordination:

- The current organization and budget structure does not encourage collaboration – we need to base it on strategic outcomes – landscape level conservation planning; ensure responsibilities for trust resources are met in an efficient way
- Need to ensure that line authority is established in the best way to enhance cooperation (i.e., programs vs. regions).
- Some groups currently collaborate and coordinate work very well – varies across regions
- Consider a dynamic organization based on ‘hot spots,’ i.e., areas where there are greater conservation risks, opportunities or needs (either geographical or ‘topical,’ e.g., avian influenza, climate change)
- Consolidate programs, *for example*:
 - *AD for Conservation Services* – oriented toward landscape conservation and hot spots; coordinators at HQ with broad range of expertise (across programs) liaison with the geographic centers
 - Geographic conservation centers liaison to the field stations
 - Field stations contain cross-program expertise, to include:
 - Migratory Birds
 - Endangered Species
 - Fisheries/Hatcheries
 - Law Enforcement
 - Federal Assistance

- Contaminants
- *AD for Land Management* (National Wildlife Refuge System)
- *AD for Conservation Support*
 - Strategy/'sense-making'
 - External Affairs
 - International Affairs
 - Grants Management (need analysis to determine if centralized or geographically-based)
- *AD for Business Support* (service centers)
 - Human Resources
 - Budget & Administration
 - Procurement
 - Information Technology
 - Global Information Systems

Recommended Actions for Directorate:

- Review Operations Plan critical success factors – prioritize them, identify overlapping priorities, examine the relationship between budget priorities and critical success factors
- Form follows function – need a Service-wide functional analysis so we can build organizational structure from a functional basis – focus on priorities, not parity
- Establish a team to focus on this – have them identify short term efficiencies for cost savings; and long term issues – use internal/external teams that already exist
- Include deputies, as well as ARDs, project leaders and program staff in any resultant 'workforce planning group'
- Tap into change management expertise; need to develop skill set within the Service (NCTC is developing a change management model)
- Need a functional office with program integration activity – looking at budgets, overlapping authorities, and relationships across programs and provide program leaders with insights for accomplishing their work – we need to provide line managers with more assistance
- Learn from efforts that have been effective, such as the National Fish Passage Program, Partners for Fish & Wildlife Program, Ohio River Valley Ecosystem Team – 'lead from behind'
- Develop outcome measures – quantifiable, measurable indicators of success in what trying to accomplish on the ground
- Talk to external partners about where they see us going – do comparison
- Survey the field to see what they think