

ELICITATION RECORD – Part 1 – Context

Elicitation title	Title of the whole elicitation exercise
Session	Title of this session. [Ignore if there is only one session.]
Date	[A session should have a single date. If elicitation continues into a second day, it should be recorded as a separate session.]
Part 1 start time	Time when the session started

Attendance and roles	List people attending, including the facilitator and any assistants. State the role that each plays in the elicitation.
Purpose of elicitation	<p>What will the elicited distributions be used for? Why is this important? Identify in broad terms the quantities of interest (about which expert opinion is sought).</p> <p>[The facilitator should emphasise here that the expertise and knowledge of the experts are a valuable part of the wider context. It is important that they do not overstate their knowledge, but it is equally important that they do not understate it. An accurate evaluation of uncertainty is essential.]</p> <p><i>This helps to ensure that experts ‘buy into’ the exercise. Also it makes clear that they are not supposed to be all-knowing. They may be less uncertain than non-experts, but we do not want to misrepresent the level of certainty that they have.</i></p>
This record	<p>Standard text: “Participants are aware that this elicitation will be conducted using the Sheffield Elicitation Framework, and that this document, including attachments, will form a record of the session.”</p> <p><i>Knowing that the exercise is being conducted according to a well established protocol, and that it will be recorded, helps to get the experts to take the task seriously.</i></p>
Orientation and training	<p>Briefly note here any pre-session orientation materials that the experts have received, and any training that has been given (whether beforehand or during this session) in probability, the nature of uncertainty, the pitfalls of expert judgement, etc. Any such materials should be attached to the record.</p> <p>It is usual to elicit distributions for one or more ‘training’ quantities, to familiarise the experts with the process. If so, this should also be noted here and the “Part 2 – Distribution” record for each elicited distribution should be attached.</p> <p>Be sure to note all attachments at the end of this Part 1 record.</p>

Participants' expertise	<p>List the expertise of each participant (including facilitator etc.)</p> <p><i>In group elicitation, it is important for all experts to be aware of, and to respect, the expertise of others. The facilitator must try to ensure that all expertise is brought out and contributes fully during the session.</i></p>
Declarations of interests	<p>Invite and note expressions of interest.</p> <p><i>Experts are often stakeholders in the wider process. They may be employees who will benefit from success in the enterprise to which the elicitation contributes. They may be invited specifically to represent a stakeholder group or point of view. Recognising the potential vested interests of themselves and other participants helps the experts to discuss openly and in an informed way. It is also important for the facilitator to be aware of possible tensions.</i></p>
Strengths and weaknesses	<p>Do the participants have the best available knowledge? Are there aspects of the problem that are under-represented or over-represented? Do declared interests or imbalances potentially bias the elicitation?</p> <p><i>Again it is helpful to bring these things into the open. If a deficiency in the group's knowledge is recognised, this does not mean that the elicitation is worthless or should be abandoned, but it is important for those who make use of the elicited distributions to be aware of such factors.</i></p>
Evidence	<p>Review the evidence about the quantities of interest. (Refer to principal sources, but do not repeat lots of detail here.)</p> <p>[The facilitator should ask each expert to discuss the relevant evidence, whether published or private. The orientation materials will typically have advised the experts to think about this in advance and to advise on key references to be available at the meeting.]</p> <p><i>Psychologists suggest that people make judgements based on the evidence that comes most readily to mind (the 'availability heuristic'). There is substantial empirical research to show that this leads to biases and impaired judgements. It is therefore important to review all the evidence at this stage so that the experts' judgements will be based on all that is relevant. The facilitator should remind them if their judgements later seem not to take some evidence into account.</i></p>
Structuring	<p>Record any choices made to structure the quantities of interest in terms of others that may be easier to elicit.</p> <p>[The experts must have the opportunity to influence which quantities are elicited, as long as the result meets the needs of the session. For instance, if eliciting a response to two different doses of a treatment, the experts may feel more comfortable thinking about the response to dose 1 and the increment in</p>

	<p>response from dose 1 to 2 (or the ratio), rather than the two responses. In particular, this kind of structuring of the problem should aim at working with quantities that the experts regard as independent.</p> <p>The above structuring example might be appropriate even when only the response on dose 2 is of interest, if the available evidence was primarily about the response on dose 1. In such a situation, elicitation about the quantity of interest may be improved by breaking it down into one component about which there is good evidence to inform the elicitation and another whose elicitation is based firmly on the experts' general expertise.]</p> <p><i>Structuring is a particularly important tool when eliciting expert judgements about several quantities. In principle, what is needed then is a multivariate, joint distribution for all those quantities. However, eliciting joint distributions is a much more complex task and is not dealt with in this version of SHELF. In practice, it is generally better to structure the quantities of interest in terms of others that the experts judge to be independent of each other. For instance in the above example of eliciting responses to two doses, these quantities would always be correlated in practice, but experts may regard the response to dose 1 as independent of the increment for dose 2.</i></p>
Definitions	<p>Identify and define carefully all quantities for which distributions are to be elicited.</p> <p>[These may be the quantities originally identified as the subject of this elicitation or others identified at the structuring step.</p> <p>Definitions are important and need to be precise. Units must be specified.]</p> <p><i>Eliciting beliefs about quantities that are opaque in any way is inviting trouble. The quantities must be as familiar as possible to the experts, and expressed in terms that are familiar. The facilitator needs to know enough of the topic to be able to pick up the experts' preferred definitions and to talk in the experts' language.</i></p>
Part 1 end time	Record when this part of the elicitation ends and the elicitation of the first distribution begins. Note also if it is necessary to revisit Part 1 (e.g. to revise definitions) at a later point in the session.
Attachments	Record all attachments. It may be necessary to add to this list during the session (but do not note this in the field above.)