**OHI Hawaii Talking Points**

**Challenges/Solutions**

Stakeholder engagement

Challenges

* Not another index? Freshwater Index, Watershed Index, Reef Health Index, etc
* Global model percpetions – had to overcome with some stakeholders
* Stakeholders stretched to capacity with other metanalysis and large projects/priorities or project seen as a threat to ongoing projects or initatives by investment and attention away
  + OTP, HIMARC, Aloha+, NOAA Coral Reef Report Card

Solutions

* Highlight what is different about OHI
  + Combination of ecological, social, and economic values for ocean health
  + Cross sectors and management areas for more holistic assessment of region ocean
  + Availability of data and tranparency of index
  + Repeat assessment to measure progress
    - This is often what we do to sell the index but this reality depends on the partnerships being maintained and investment in repeat assessements which is not secured in most cases
* Need to show synergy directly with other initatives
  + This is hard to do when developing the Index as some of these synergies or connections will only be made explicit when the goal models are developed
  + Remind stakeholders that they are important to understanding overall ocean health
  + Show through matrix or graphic at all presentations and communication events
* Maintained participation
  + Smaller working groups

Collaborative partnerships

* LOR, data usage, logos and messaging

Data management

Challenges

* Availability of data – one of the strengths of the OHI is data aquisition into one place – one of the weaknesses is loss in value of that data to partners for later uses if aggregated to OHI spatial scale
* Communicating data needs – how many years, summarized to what scale, etc
  + Hard to tell partners how to summarize data or data needs without first seeing the data they have – different goals have different scales, summarize by habitats is also important

Solutions

* Create links to original data sources or better yet, searchable database of original data
  + this has to be updated as the assessments are updated

Scale

* Traditional management scales (effetive management scales) vs contempary/policy management scales

**Adapting Goal Models**

* FIS
  + Spatial scale is different depending on the fishery
    - Pelagic, bottomfish, and coastal pelagics are at the scale of the EEZ
    - Reef/nearshore fisheries are at the regional scales - challenge – reduces the weight of the reef fish score but reef fish are included in AO also (could divide catch by regions for EEZ fisheries)
    - Used multiple sustainability scores that are dependent of the type of fishery
    - Did not use Fmsy – not available for all fisheries assessments
* AO
  + Goal based on two indicators: Access and Availability
    - Availability
      * Fish biomass scores – fish biomass in region in reference to pristine reef fish biomass (Williams et al. 2015) – worked with NOAA report card and used their indicators
    - Access – two sub indicators, both remove MPAs and military zones
      * Boat access
      * Shoreline access
* SP
  + LPS
    - Marine managed areas to 3nm – part of the state initative to protect 30% of the nearshore marine areas by 2030
  + CON (connection to place)
    - Proxy for the connection or value that poeple have for oceans and coastal areas
      * Recreation rates in ocean and coastal activities
      * Hawaiian place names
      * Stewardship actions