**CPH Proposal for EPDP public comment review approach**

Whilst we appreciate the challenge of finding an approach that is both effective and works for all members, the CPH does not support the 3 small team proposal as the best way to review public comments.[[1]](#footnote-1)  
  
Dividing the EPDP Team into 3 Small teams creates huge coordination challenges for each group and puts a significant burden on the individuals who have to represent their group.  EPDP topics are so interrelated that it’s difficult to discuss in the vacuum of small teams and given the necessary need to ensure all differing interests are represented in each team, there is likely to be same lack of consensus that exists in the team as a whole.  Furthermore, dividing up group members will necessitate an increase in the amount of time that will have to be spent discussing progress and concerns within each group. Being on the EPDP Team is already a huge time commitment for its members, and presumably few can afford to commit even more time to be able to keep up to date on 3 teams, instead of 1.   
  
Therefore the CPH would like to propose the following alternate approach:  
  
1) Staff confirm the order in which each purpose/recommendation is going to be reviewed  
  
2) Instead of meeting as a team (or small teams) allow this Tuesday’s (8 January 2019) call time to be used by each group to go through the public comments themselves.  We appreciate that members have already been asked to review all public comments, but in practise, it is unlikely that most have had the time to do so.  
  
3) Each group should review the public comments for each purpose and recommendation (in the order specified by staff as per 1) and agree on their position. If, after reviewing the public comments, a group would like to change their position, they need to provide a rationale as to why.  If the group's position is unchanged, they should identify why they haven't changed their position.  
  
4) Each group should provide their position and rationale for each purpose/recommendation in writing, in advance of the meeting where it is going to be discussed, so that Staff can present it to the whole group in a review-friendly format  
  
5) The EPDP Team continues to meet as a whole team on Tuesdays and Thursdays, but instead of discussing the individual public comments, it discusses the position of each group on the public comments of each recommendation/purpose, where there is no consensus.  
  
6) In between meetings, the list should be utilised to continue discussion, one topic at a time.  List discussion should be highly focused and structured, for example providing a response to specific questions.

1. Although CPH representatives discussed at their meeting this morning the 3-team proposal that had been put forward over the weekend, the rationale applies also to the more recent 2-team proposal. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)