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Overview of Kickoff Discussion

Coordinating Committee’s Positions

• As we move from fact-finding to making recommendations, both the Advisory Committee and its subcommittees will need to make decisions. Examples could include recommendations about:
  • NSDS technical architecture
  • The range of services the NSDS might offer federal, state, and local government
  • How law, regulation, and guidance might be shaped to support evidence building
  • Approaches for privacy protection or ensuring confidentiality

• Today, we present a general model for decision-making that we believe is principle-based, transparent, and gives equal voice to all perspectives.

• We believe it is applicable to decisions at the Advisory Committee and subcommittee level, and we welcome your feedback.
Decision-making Proposal (1 of 2)

General Model for Advisory and Subcommittees

• **Briefly.** When deciding between two or more options, each individual committee member will rank order their choices based upon a set of shared, mutually agreed-upon criteria. The most favorably ranked option overall will prevail.

• **Step 1.** Prior to developing options in response to a given decision, the committee will agree upon the criteria they will use to rank potential solutions. A set of “generic” criteria will be promulgated by the coordinating committee.

• **Step 2.** When a decision is to be made, committees will have a robust discussion of each option, with an opportunity to explore solutions relative to the decision-making criteria.

• **Step 3.** Each committee member individually ranks options based upon the agreed-upon criteria.

• **Step 4.** Rankings for each option are averaged across all members, with the most favorably ranked option being selected. In the case of a tie, the committee will go back to Step 2 and reconsider only the tied options.
Decision-making Proposal (2 of 2)

Example Criteria: Selecting Pilots to Demonstrate Potential of a NSDS

• **Criterion 1 – Value proposition to stakeholders.** To what extent does the option have the potential to lead to a solution given timeliness and saliency for key stakeholders?

• **Criterion 2 – Technical feasibility.** To what extent is the option feasible given existing or planned technology?

• **Criterion 3 – Resource feasibility.** To what extent are necessary resources, including people, time, and money, available to implement the option?

• **Criterion 4 – Privacy and legal considerations.** To what extent is the solution free of significant concerns related to personal privacy, law, or regulation?

Other criteria could be adopted by the ACDEB or subcommittees as needed to evaluate their options, but all criteria must be specified a priori and have an agreed upon definition.
Full Committee Discussion

Discussion Questions

• How likely is it this model will yield high-quality decisions?
• How effectively does this model balance burdens vs. benefits?
• How likely is it this model will work for the range of issues confronting the group?