Instructions for Review of NEMIA Chapter 7: Policy Actions and Implementation Strategy

The primary objective of NEMIA is to use the analyses conducted by the technical assessment teams to draft and evaluate policy options related to sustainable tourism and economic development that can be implemented by the appropriate decision-makers in the region. These policy options were referred to in the NEMIA process as “potential actions.” In an integrated assessment, it is not enough to outline potential actions — an effective integrated assessment also provides information on the most effective ways to implement each of the potential actions. Chapter 7 of the NEMIA report (“Policy Actions and Implementation Strategy”), provides this implementation guidance for the potential actions developed during the NEMIA process by a workgroup made up of regional stakeholders.

Because of your expertise in cultural and/or natural resources-based tourism, you have been asked to review the NEMIA implementation strategy. To effectively review this chapter requires first being familiar with the NEMIA process (chapter 1) and the technical assessments (chapters 2-6), since it is the results and analyses of these assessments that provided the scientific basis for the potential actions drafted by the NEMIA workgroup. In addition, reading the introduction chapter and technical assessments will provide background on the NEMIA process and will familiarize you with the regional socioeconomic, ecological, cultural, and land use planning context for the project.

We therefore ask that you begin by reading the entire report, and then in a separate document, please answer the following questions:

1. **Content**
   a. Is sufficient background information provided to place this chapter in context with the NEMIA process and the other chapters in the NEMIA report?
   b. How well does the implementation advice integrate the findings of the technical assessments?
   c. How practical is the implementation advice and is it relevant to the potential actions?
   d. What other implementation methods and strategies do you suggest for implementing the potential actions?
   e. How does the implementation advice differ from what you would expect based on the description of the IA steps on the IA factsheet?
   f. What are the implementation strategy’s strengths? Weaknesses?
   g. How could the implementation strategy be improved?

2. **Organization/Formatting/Style**
   a. Is the chapter organized logically, efficiently, and clearly?
   b. Should the text be expanded or condensed? If so, which sections?
   c. Have the authors chosen the best format (table, figure, or numbers in text) for presenting information?
   d. Are there other figures/tables that would have helped better illustrate text?
3. Research Integrity
   a. Are there sufficient references to information from primary literature?
   b. Are there sufficient references from peer-reviewed sources?
   c. Could the authors make better use of their references? How?
   d. What other resources should the authors have considered?
   e. Do the authors make clear any assumptions they made?
   f. Is the chapter value-independent? If no, what biases are evident?

4. In addition to your review of Chapter 7, we are also seeking comment on how the IA organizing team could have planned this integrated assessment to more closely align with the IA model as described in the Michigan Sea Grant IA Fact Sheet (see below). In other words, if we had unlimited resources and complete discretion, how could this integrated assessment (as a whole) have been better executed?