

CMAG 2017 Self evaluation review

Summary

CMAG review of the 2017 Self evaluation

Actions

| Date | Requested action | Requester (s) | Response required by: | Comments |
|------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 15 November 2017 | Review of the 2017 CMAG self evaluation document | Cathy Richardson | <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Camilla Wiberg Danielsen 05 Dec 2017 Please review the attached draft of the CMAG self evaluation for 2017 and provide comments as required.✓ Daniel Karlsson 05 Dec 2017 Please review the attached draft of the CMAG self evaluation for 2017 and provide comments as required.✓ Elaine Wooler 05 Dec 2017 Please review the attached draft of the CMAG self evaluation for 2017 and provide comments as required.✓ Elze de Groot 05 Dec 2017 Please review the attached draft of the CMAG self evaluation for 2017 and provide comments as required.✓ John Fountain 05 Dec 2017 Please review the attached draft of the CMAG self evaluation for 2017 and provide comments as required.✓ Linda Parisien 05 Dec 2017 Please review the attached draft of the CMAG self evaluation for 2017 and provide comments as required.✓ Matt Cordell 05 Dec 2017 Please review the attached draft of the CMAG self evaluation for 2017 and provide comments as required.✓ Olivier Bodenreider 05 Dec 2017 Please review the attached draft of the CMAG self evaluation for 2017 and provide comments as required.✓ Jostein Ven 05 Dec 2017 Please review the attached draft of the CMAG self evaluation for 2017 and provide comments as required.✓ Johannes Gnaegi 05 Dec 2017 Please review the attached draft of the CMAG self evaluation for 2017 and provide comments as required. | Please post your final responses in the Country response table below. Discussion comments can be made as comments. |

Relevant documents

| File | Modified |
|--|---------------------------------|
| PDF File CMAG Self Evaluation_201711XX_v0.1.docx.pdf | 2017-Nov-14 by Cathy Richardson |

Links

[2017-11-14 - CMAG Meeting](#)

Country response

| Country | Date | Response |
|---------|------|----------|
|---------|------|----------|

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|
| U.S. | 15 OCT 2017 | <p>Esstially OK. Here are a few suggestions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To substantiate out contribution, would recommend to list (at least some of) the projects and topics on which CMAG has provided national perspective. ▪ Would also mention the venues to which the extension analysis has been reported (business meetings in April 2017, poster at the Expo in October 2017). ▪ Finally, would point out that several new menmbers have joined in 2017, providing a broader perspective from member countries, while remaining agile and engaged. |
| NZ | 5Dec 17 | OK by me |
| CA | 8Dec2 017 | It looks good |
| UK | 8DEC 17 | Looks good though agree with Olivier's suggestions for some additional information. |
| SE | 8DEC 17 | Agreeing in principle with Olivier, but I'm not sure of the function of this document. If it's a box-ticking exercise, everything in the table is true and we've done some good work, and it is fine as is. If it's to be distributed more widely then more details, through links etc., could be provided. |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Member countries without a CMAG rep | | |

CMAG response

| Date | CMAG Response | Next steps |
|------|---------------|------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Final outcome:

Date: