Albertien opens the TC and thanks Kim for being flexible. In light of having changed the date twice for this TC, the Council agrees to stick to the dates agreed in our meeting schedule in the future.

Identify and agree in principle on some issues regarding the consultancy:

-Stakeholders
The Council has started creating a list with names of stakeholders who they want to include in the evaluation process. This list has not been finished and the Council is asked their opinion on whether this is still needed. The Council feels that in phase 1 (the diagnostic phase) there is no added value of interviewing an extra group of people.

-Inclusiveness
Regarding the inclusiveness of the process, in particular regarding the MT, there seem different opinions whether this has been done sufficiently. Tankred feels that the process should be inclusive and the MT has indeed been included sufficiently, but underlines that the Council should communicate clearly to the MT about the process and what the OCA C wants. Albertien thinks there maybe some problems with the Council being responsible for and at the same time being part of the review. Furthermore, Tankred has asked in a mail Council – members to identify key processes in the OCA. She suggested ask the MT the same questions, considering that the answers will be different, the Council being an associative and controlling body and the MT an implementing body. Christa disagrees, as she thinks the question of OCA processes applies whether you re on the MT or the Council, and anyway individuals will have different answers.

Looking at the methodology of the review, Albertien is if the opinion that the process is upside down. Instead of doing interviews first and complete this with open more questions, it should be the other way around. First an analysis first based on existing information and open questions (such as identifying key processes), then adjust existing questionnaires (tools) to the specifics of the OCA.

The Council members decide on asking Ian who is entering the meeting.

Session with Ian Vale (=mc)
The Council was asked to identify internal and external processes, but likes to know how this fits in the set up of the review. According to Ian, every organization defines the assistance/work they deliver. At the same time, there are internal processes and strategies to deliver. Ian wants to know how the OCA puts a strategy together.

Albertien wonders why questions like this are asked now and not in the beginning of the review. Ian explains that the answers are clear to him, but he wants to compare this to the answers of the group, to see if this is well reflected. This information will be used also for the business process mapping.

On the issue of including extra stakeholders in this phase of the review, Ian notes that this will be more costly and time-consuming, although it could add an extra depth to the diagnosis. Ian confirms that in the next phase this will also be possible, as the process is flexible. Ian feels confident that there is enough information for this stage of the review and he would be surprised if extra stakeholders would add something new. At the moment, the review is at the end of stage 1, although not all activities have been finished. The option of a workshop is taken out of phase 1, but during phase 2 or 3 there is an option to include a workshop. Joanne has concerns on how to make the Board fully and positively engaged. According to Ian there will always be questions of doubts and people not feeling directly involved, but at the moment everyone who should be involved, is involved.
Paul agrees that the MT is involved sufficiently and isn’t dissatisfied with the process. He remarks that only Albertien has raised questions about the methodology. Questions from Ian to the Council:
1: Who does the council want to include in the initial check on the feasibility and appropriateness of the options? 2: What does the Council want to do with the report ready in end of January? 3: Does the Council want a workshop and when? 4. Does the Council want to involve extra people? The Council decides to discuss these questions itself first and provide feedback to Ian later. Ian leaves the TC.

**Next steps**

Ian has answered some questions on the methodology raised by Albertien. In particular, Ian has expressed confidence that his methodology will provide the required output. Albertien is willing to give it the benefit of the doubt. However, she warns against the Council expressing full confidence in the methodology. She suggests using a phrase like “no reasons to doubt the methodology for the time being” or similar words in the response to the MT. As for the comment by Joanne, the main issue is how to keep OCA MT members engaged knowing the feedback by the OCA MT instead of the board as written in the note.

**On behalf of the Council, Tankred will draft an answer to the letter of the MT in which they express concerns about the inclusiveness of the process and the methodology.** Timing: before the next OCA MT meeting (Thursday 17th January). Letter will include (part of) Ian’s response and relevant information coming out of this TC. If there is a further need to clarify this response, the Council could invite Ian to the next meeting of the OCA MT. This option will be included in the letter. Albertien and Tankred volunteer to be present at this part of the OCA MT meeting as observers.

The Council then discusses the 5 bullet points at page 4 of and decides:

- incorporate working with a representative of the MT as well as the Council (already discussed see above): majority is not in favour.
- undertake more interviews with additional stakeholders in phase 1 (also discussed see above): no review interview approach, duration and questions before undertaking further interviews: (also discussed see above) no, at this point of time
- plan workshops for the MT and Council (before 29th February): to be discussed after report has been received
- continue with the review exercise to create a group competency profile for the Council: yes

Tankred explains this (point 5) will be based on standard questionnaire to be filled in online. Albertien expresses disagreement. In her experience information out of the first part should be used to modify standard questionnaires in a later phase if you want information specifically relevant for the organization under review. She suggests to discuss this with Ian. All other members have confidence in the use of and are committed to do the standard competence questionnaire. Tankred emphasizes the need to move forwards and have faith in this evaluation. Several people indicate that we should not be expecting questionnaires specifically tailored for the OCA (we pay for a medium model, not a Rolls Royce).

There will be a combined meeting of MT and Council on 29 February-1 March. Albertien reminds that the Council has already agreed that on one of these days OCA C and OCA MT would discuss the review together. She suggests 1 March. All agree. The suggestion of Christa to include the MSF UK new GD is welcomed. Albertien will also invite the MSF H interim GD who is also starting 1st March. Tibor is wonders if there are earlier possibilities, considering the need to finalize everything well before the GA(s).

**The Council decides to schedule an extra TC after the report is finished (end of January) in order to look at the options for sharing the report with the sectional Boards, MT and possibly other stakeholders.**
Doug, Tankred and Albertien volunteer to read the first draft report.

(NB the question which stakeholders to involve to do an initial check on appropriateness and feasibility on the options during the preparation of the report was not answered. According to Ian it is unlikely there is a need to go beyond the MT and OCA C. He suggests various options, including a call to all and hopes that the OCA C will decide which option is the most suitable).

Letter MSF Canada and further steps
MSF-Can informs the Council that their Board meeting in December, with the visit of MT members of the three other sections, was interesting and informative. After the drastic measure of withdrawing the MSF Canada GD from the OCA MT, it was interesting to hear from other OCA MT members how they experienced the problems and how they saw the way forward. Several members of the council express surprise on the MSF Canada suggestion to initiate a process by the 4 GDs and 4 President to clarify the visions for the OCA at this moment in time, when the OCA review is going on and there is agreement on the process, timeline and desired output.

Although the letter can be read to mean that Marilyn will return to active involvement in the OCA MT mid March, Joanne and Joni reassure the Council that Marilyn will be present at the meeting on 1st March. MSF-Can is willing to take a leap of faith. It’s now important to work on a vision and initiate the process. MSF-Can explains they’d like a response from the Council that includes support for their proposal on rules of engagement of the MT, any initiative of the Council to facilitate further work on a vision for the OCA and agreement to use a new communication tool. This tool will avoid communication problems, like a chat website where you can find back easily all communication and comments back.

The Council doesn’t feel a need for a formal response to the letter. MSF-Can prefers a formal answer but can live with giving feedback to their board in an informal way. Joanne will have a MSF Can Board meeting in 3 days and if urgent matters arise, she will contact Albertien.

Action list:
Tankred will draft a response to the letter of the MT in time for the next OCA MT meeting (17th January). All council members will mail Tankred their homework on key processes before the end of this week. 29th February F2F meeting will be for Council members only, 1st March for OCA C and MT. The new GD MSF-UK and interim GD MSF-H will be invited by Christa and Albertien respectively. Tankred will send a mail around with a date for the next TC (15 February suggested).