

**THE MANATEE REHABILITATION PARTNERSHIP
MEETING, MARCH 15, 2006**

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

STRENGTHS

- ✓ Helps animals that are not doing well-recaptures can be recommended
- ✓ Group strength and knowledge
- ✓ Provides very important data so we can learn
- ✓ Makes the program a responsible one - follow-up is critical
- ✓ Improves dialogue/collaboration/cooperation
- ✓ Common goal
- ✓ Long term working relationship
- ✓ Group cohesion
- ✓ Here for the manatees
- ✓ Broad perspectives and expertise re: manatee rehabilitation and care
- ✓ Wildlife trust partnership to credible
- ✓ Shared interest in contributing to manatee recovery
- ✓ Stable core of funding from state of Florida
- ✓ Contributes to manatee recovery
- ✓ Enables sharing resources
- ✓ Mission contributes to manatee recovery
- ✓ Expertise in field component
- ✓ Partner Resources available for education, media (press releases), fund-raising
- ✓ Fewer constraints as a non-governmental entity
- ✓ Promotes partnerships
- ✓ Promotes manatee awareness-education
- ✓ Contributes to success of rehab program
- ✓ Manatee expertise
- ✓ Strength in partnerships
- ✓ Vet knowledge
- ✓ Varied backgrounds
- ✓ Provides reassurance to institutions releasing manatees
- ✓ Pooling of resources
- ✓ Equipment and trained staff to track and assess animals
- ✓ Experts from all facets (brain trust)
- ✓ Members' ability and willingness to contribute money and other resources
- ✓ Knowledge
- ✓ Lots of expertise

- ✓ Familiar with each other
- ✓ Initial common goal
- ✓ Sharing of resources
- ✓ Collaborative nature of group
- ✓ Follow up on question of releases
- ✓ Diverse group of agencies/organizations working together on manatee rehab and recovery
- ✓ Desire for humane animal care
- ✓ A possible model for government and private industry cooperation
- ✓ Great confidence in level of manatee tracking
- ✓ Experience
- ✓ Collective knowledge
- ✓ Resources/money
- ✓ Manatee tracking
- ✓ Public/private partnership, brings diversity of talents and strengths
- ✓ Pooling of expertise
- ✓ Dedication of partners to mission
- ✓ Improves likelihood of manatee survival
- ✓ Provides to the public that state/federal and private sectors are working together for common goal
- ✓ Mix of federal, state, and private interests
- ✓ Increase chances of survival among released manatees
- ✓ Private/government consortium
- ✓ Most likely the greatest manatee expertise in the world
- ✓ Unprecedented level of multi-group cooperation to ensure these animals are tracked
- ✓ Group of people who truly care about manatees and the environment
- ✓ Post release monitoring

WEAKNESSES

- Personal agendas
- Personal agendas or expected outcome
- Independent of established manatee umbrella
- Unclear who makes decisions
- Decision makers do not always make meetings
- Independent of Manatee Service (network)
- Dishonesty
- Petty personality in-fighting among partners
- Focus has expanded
- Tug of war between state and feds

- Finding resources to keep programs running is tough
- Limited number of animals can be tracked
- Lack process for determining leadership
- Lack of process for clear decision making
- No formal level for decision making
- Unclear how decisions are made
- No structure for making decisions
- Group process on decision making
- No system for recording decisions
- Different organization agendas
- No established criteria for membership, or process for inviting members
- State funding is insufficient
- Fear of change
- Not like minded as could be
- Territorial
- Agency control, not partnership
- Largely volunteer basis
- Ineffective committees
- Feds need to take responsibility for unilateral decisions
- Loss of funding/loss of involvement
- Group lacks decision process that all agree on
- Partners lack of time to devote to MRP
- Trying unsuccessfully to accomplish more than core mission of monitoring post release
- Leadership: who and the focus
- No clear study design
- Communication
- Funding of process
- Communication weak/low between meetings
- Ego
- Individuals not speaking their mind during meetings
- Lack of direction
- Different motives for participants
- Unclear goals
- State vs. federal/lack of cooperation
- The group's vision

OPPORTUNITIES

- ❖ Communication/facilitation
- ❖ To make MRP go away and fold duties back under FMT
- ❖ Education of public

- ❖ Chance to develop governance for the group
- ❖ Generate public support for program activities
- ❖ Wide public interest in manatee issues
- ❖ Sharing ideas
- ❖ Enhances approach to manatee survival by involving many organizations
- ❖ Better science
- ❖ Make a bigger difference
- ❖ Structure group in a more formal process or role responsibility to other group
- ❖ To focus on core mission of post release monitoring and do away with the rest
- ❖ Chance to put formal decision making process in place
- ❖ Chance to develop formal governance structure
- ❖ To streamline and reduce number of meetings
- ❖ Regroup and restate the MRP vision and mission
- ❖ Help the manatee long term survival
- ❖ Provide example for other endangered species programs
- ❖ Resources/money
- ❖ Promote manatee awareness/conservation
- ❖ Need to evaluate effectiveness need for more committees
- ❖ Provides novel opportunity for funding
- ❖ Cooperation to get project accomplished
- ❖ Coordination with larger species recovery effort
- ❖ Education

CHALLENGES

- Developing common mission/objectives
- Communication
- Facilitation of communication
- Listening
- Coordination between federal, state, and conservation organizations (shared vision)
- Extending program outside Florida
- Group communications
- Politics
- Need to develop outside funding sources
- Most people are too busy with their current jobs to direct time to the MRP
- Individual or institutional or agency goals
- How MRP is formed
- How complex the MRP has evolved
- Clarify how MRP falls under recovery team

- Deciding appropriate role in recovery effort/team
- Obtaining funding
- Cost
- Differences of opinion between state and federal agencies
- Understanding of intention of group members
- Central goal(s)
- Vested interest in continuation
- Big egos
- Should be working to eliminate our purpose (i.e. decrease number of animals to track/rehab)
- See errors; say corrections; move on!
- Time constraints
- Keeping focused on manatee common vision
- Know when you were wrong
- Pride
- Patience
- Coordinating activities
- Recognizing opportunities
- Development of governance structure
- How to work as "partners"
- State power grab
- To have a vote today to dissolve the MRP
- Group process in decision making
- Personalities
- Permit process
- Having a shared vision
- Assuring decision makers get to meetings
- Feds need to treat this as a partnership
- Manatees losing tags
- Developing a stable funding base
- Resource availability
- Funding that matches changing requirements
- Funding for tracking
- Funding (notes 5 times)
- Fund raising

What would be lost if the MRP was disbanded?

1. Input at the table when decisions are made.
2. Potential reduction of money due to perceived loss of an alliance (donor participation).

3. The credibility of the MRP when under the Manatee Recovery Team.
4. Positive public perception (the public/private partnership led strength and credibility).
5. Post release monitoring.
6. Central location for pooling of resources.
7. Less meetings
8. Educational component
9. Outside researchers using MRP for research projects.
10. The products associated with the MRP (Logo, website, etc.)
11. Lost value of the confidence of administrative decision makers of other entities
12. Grant funding potential or other funding sources

Interim Decision:

1. Wildlife Trust will accept administrative duties for MRP until the next meeting. They are willing to discuss if they would accept this responsibility in the future, but this would be discussed at the next meeting.
2. The next meeting is to be held during the month of May, 2006 or before.
3. Buddy and Jane will Co-Chair the next meeting.
4. One agenda item for the next meeting will be the position of Chair and the term.
5. One agenda item for the next meeting will be the 2006-2007 budget.
6. One agenda item for the next meeting will be initiating strategic planning.

1st Ranking of Decision

5	4	3	2	1
13	7	2	1	0

#6 above-Strategic Planning was added after the first ranking.

2nd Ranking of Decision

5	4	3	2	1
15	5	2	0	0

The above decisions were adopted by consensus.

Consensus Ranking:

- 5- Great idea
- 4- Support

- 3- Neutral but support outside room
- 2- Still have some concerns
- 1- Oppose
