



The team next reviewed the feedback received from the workshop. Nearly two-thirds of the participants filled out an evaluation form – another indication of the success of the workshop. This feedback could feed into the recommendations going forward and we should provide some mechanism to thank those to provided input and show what we learned. It could be an appendix to our report.

Feedback on the need and form of a network of consensus practitioners was somewhat split. There are a lot of interesting ideas about how to develop a network that would provide information and mentorship.

### **3) Review proceedings and checklist**

The day one and day two proceedings were viewed as separate deliverables. The day one proceedings are nearly ready to be made public. The day two minutes are going to be useful to build the report and recommendations.

The day one proceedings were vetted with all speakers (we're still waiting for one). Therefore, the team felt that they should accept the information currently presented and highlighted editorial changes. It was agreed to add the MC's biography and invite those who spoke at lunch to provide a bio as well. The agenda would be a useful appendix.

**Action item 12.1: George will provide his bio and his closing remarks.**

**Action item 12.2: Jennifer will contact the lunchtime speakers for their biographies.**

The team also agreed to make the proceedings public before the Board's approval. A note on the title page can indicated the board has yet to approve the entire package from the team.

The team then reviewed the minutes from the second day and agreed they should be an appendix to the final report. There was a conversation if the team should have provided honoraria to stakeholders who attended the second day. Generally, CASA does not provide honoraria to attend workshops, however other teams recently set the precedent. The determination now seems to be if stakeholders are asked to do work for the team. CASA is already planning to incorporate this new practice in our stakeholder support policy. If useful, the team could provide a recommendation separate from the report that will outline

The checklist is a great start. The team divided the questions into five discreet tables, each useful for different stages in the process. Viewing the checklist in the context of different stages in the process, and the different questions necessary at each stage, helped the team streamline the items. The checklist should be a stand alone tool held separate from the report. The changes made by the team will be reflected in the next version.

The report and tool should be presented as:

1. Report:
  - a. Context, Day one and Day two (including methodology for the tool); feedback received on the events; recommendations
2. Stand-alone tool
  - a. Intro – who, why, how to use this tool
  - b. Screening stage

- c. Fundamentals
  - d. Communications in process
  - e. Ongoing Process Assessment
  - f. Recognition
  - g. Conclusion (living document)
3. Appendices:
- a. Team list
  - b. Terms of Reference
  - c. Day 2 minutes

For each piece of section 2 (the tool) there should be an introduction explaining the context (when, who and why these questions are important at this stage). The team agreed the secretariat could hire a report writer if necessary.

## **4) Recommendations**

Team members will forward ideas for recommendations to Jennifer before our next teleconference. Ideas at this meeting were centered on how to spend the remaining funds:

- Hold future workshops on this issue
- Create a blog, or some other appropriate forum, for people to post comments, ideas, questions, information etc on consensus decision making.

## **5) Next steps**

Jennifer will work on the report and checklist, or hire someone to help. The team will present its report and recommendations to the CASA board for approval March 24 in Calgary. That night works for the wrap-up party.

The next meeting will be at teleconference February 19 at 8.15 – 10.15.

The meeting was adjourned at 3.10.