

**White House Conference on Cooperative Conservation  
Day 2 Breakout Session Compilation**

**Topic:** Using Science and Technology to Reach Cooperative Conservation Goals

**Session number:** 52

**Afternoon**

**Facilitator:** Dave Ceppos

**Location:** 226

*This summary cannot be more than two pages; allocate space as needed among the categories.*

**A. Major Repeated Themes Raised in the Discussion.** *A grouping of ideas repeated with some frequency in the session and brought up again during the group summation process. Also includes diverging views and/or questions about the topic.*

Important to establish mutual agreement on what constitutes credible science. There are various ways to achieve this, ranging everywhere from development of national peer review systems, to small group specific rules of engagement. Regardless of method, it is nonetheless a very compelling need.

- Need to consider incentives to developing mutual agreement, such as reprimands and/or rewards.

Need to further discuss the benefits and drawbacks to creating a national data system. The system could include but not be limited to protocols for collection, use, management, update, sharing, etc. There were very diverse strong feelings about this suggestion.

Need new tools, including but not limited to policies and legislation, to support adding monitoring to all conservation programs with commensurate funding.

Need to involve stakeholders at the most localized level and at the onset to identify what the key questions, determine the methods to answering the questions, advise on the resource requirements to support the effort, etc.

Need to honor and respect cultural norms and local anecdotal data that is provided by indigenous people, large land owners, mutli-generational families, etc. These data sources and the information they provide need to be considered equivalent to other more traditional/academic scientific endeavors.

*This document represents the views of the individual participants and does not reflect group consensus.*

**B. National-level Practical Actions** *that could be taken by the Federal government, national NGO's, and other national organizations. Diverging views and/or questions are also noted.*

We should consider as an action an evaluation of how much existing law poses an impediment to cooperative cooperation and we need to evaluate the role that existing resource laws have on encouraging/mandating the use of science and technology in monitoring cooperative conservation.

We need to consider either nontraditional interpretations of NEPA, or restructuring NEPA as a means to better accommodate adaptive management, ranges of potential scenarios, ranges of potential actions, etc.

**C. Local-level Practical Actions** *that could be taken at the local or community level by Tribes, state and local communities, private citizens, and local organizations. Diverging views and/or questions are also noted.*

Need to involve stakeholders at the most localized level and at the onset to identify what the key questions, determine the methods to answering the questions, advise on the resource requirements to support the effort, etc.

Need to honor and respect cultural norms and local anecdotal data that is provided by indigenous people, large land owners, mutli-generational families, etc. These data sources and the information they provide need to be considered equivalent to other more traditional/academic scientific endeavors.

**D. Particularly insightful quotes from participants** that capture the essence of key points made during the group's discussion.

*This document represents the views of the individual participants and does not reflect group consensus.*