

THEME 01 · DATA, MEASUREMENT & EVIDENCE

Table S1 · Defensible Measurement Infrastructure

From observation to operating commitment.

WHY THIS TOPIC, WHY NOW

Participants arrive at this table having likely spent two rotations on the measurement question - the Tech side on data quality, integration, metrics, and analytics; the Human side on the healthy worker and human-centric risk. This table is where the conversation moves from surfacing the issues to making commitments.

BenchmarkESG's working practice has been built around the translation problem: from the data the organization actually has to the executive evidence base an operating decision requires. Two facts will have surfaced by now: most OEHS measurement infrastructure was built for compliance reporting, not for operating decisions; and the gap between what the organization could defend and what it currently produces is wider than most leaders will say out loud. This table asks what closes that gap, who commits to it, and what the field needs to share.

THE FRAMING QUESTION

"Walk into your 2027 budget meeting with one OEHS measurement-infrastructure commitment that the conversations you just heard would make defensible. What is it?"

FOUR QUESTIONS

Q1 · Organizational Actions (0:10–0:20)

Tell us about a measurement-infrastructure commitment your organization has already made that you'd teach the field to copy. What was the commitment, and what made it real?

Listening for: *Listen for the operating anatomy of the commitment, not the marketing version. Strong answers name a specific authority, a specific budget, a specific governance practice.*

Q2 · Blocked Actions (0:20–0:30)

What measurement-infrastructure action would your organization take if it were defensible to make? What's blocking the move?

Listening for: *Listen for the real blocker. Honest answers are about what the participant can't get internally, not what the field hasn't built yet.*

Q3 · Field-Level Levers (0:30–0:40)

What does the field need to share, anchor, or jointly build to make this defensible at scale?

Listening for: *Listen for how specific the lever is. "We need the profession to do something" is less useful than "we need an anchored disclosure schema that lines up with SEC human-capital reporting." Artifact-level specifics are what make the lever real.*

Q4 · Room Commits (0:40–0:50)

What does this room itself commit to that makes the harder action possible? Who owns the next step?

Listening for: *Listen for named owners. A commitment without a named owner is just aspiration. Who carries the work between now and the next convening is the open question; what surfaces here goes directly into the field-level readout.*

PATTERNS TO REDIRECT FROM

The vendor-pitch gravity. This table pulls toward vendor-product talk more than any other in the Solutions rotation - both because the platform partner is in the chair and because measurement-infrastructure conversations slide naturally toward platforms. The discipline is to keep the conversation at the commitment-and-governance layer. If the room asks specifically about the anchor's offering, name it briefly and pull back: "We can talk about the platform after - what's the commitment underneath that the field needs?"

The aspiration-vs-commitment gap. Senior OEHS executives are well-practiced at the language of "we should." The Solutions rotation is where you press past "should" toward "will." If a participant offers a "we should" statement, ask: "Who commits, by when, with what evidence the commitment held?" The discomfort of the press is the substance of the table.

The profession-deferral pattern. Many asks will route toward credentialing, research, or peer associations. Some of those are correctly routed; others are a way to offload commitment the room itself should be carrying. Surface where the handoff is appropriate field-level work and where it's avoidance of the room's own authority.

WHERE THIS TABLE SITS IN THE LARGER ROOM

This is the final rotation. The three lines this table lands feed Monday's plenary readout.

CONNECTED TABLE

WHERE IT REJOINS YOURS

Solutions · Worker Voice in the Measurement Frame
(Theme 1 sibling)

The sibling Solutions table on the same theme, Human-leaning. Same room synthesis, different anchor. Participants who came through the Human-side measurement conversations may end up at this table; the two Solutions outputs together produce the Theme 1 readout for the day.

Solutions · The Investment Case That Holds
(Theme 4)

Measurement-infrastructure investment lives or dies on the business case. The Theme 4 Tech-leaning Solutions table is the funding-side companion. If your conversation reaches the budget question, that table is the mirror.

Solutions · AI Governance That Survives Audit
(Theme 2)

Measurement infrastructure is what AI governance rests on. If your conversation reaches the question of what data layer the next AI deployment requires, that table is the closest companion.

WHAT THE TABLE IS AND ISN'T TRYING TO PRODUCE

What this table is holding for: Be comfortable pushing for action language. "That's a should statement - what's the will statement?" is the question this conversation returns to most. Working familiarity with what the Tech-side conversations covered and recognition of the Human-side ones. The anchor's offering is relevant; it isn't the conversation.

What this table isn't trying to produce: A product walkthrough. Solutions discipline applies even at the partner's own chair. A clean resolution to the Tech-versus-Human measurement debates - those continue at the sibling Solutions table and into Monday's synthesis. Unanimous room commitment; the deliverable is what each participant carries back plus the field-level asks the room owns together.

THEME 01 · DATA, MEASUREMENT & EVIDENCE

Table S2 · Worker Voice in the Measurement Frame

What the field commits to measuring about the worker that it currently doesn't.

WHY THIS TOPIC, WHY NOW

Participants arrive at this table having likely spent two rotations on the measurement question - the Human side on defining the healthy worker and measuring human-centric risk, the Tech side on the data and analytics infrastructure that would carry those measurements. Those conversations surfaced where the field's measurement boundary falls short of what workers actually experience on the job. This table is where the conversation moves from surfacing to commitment.

Rachel's anchor is the worker-voice perspective - whose measurement gets counted, and what is structurally left out of the operating record. Two facts will have surfaced: most measurement infrastructure wasn't designed for the worker-voice frame, and the consent, governance, and trust process required to make worker-voice measurement defensible is largely unbuilt. This table asks what the field commits to building, who carries the work, and what the association and peer levers are.

THE FRAMING QUESTION

“Walk into your 2027 capital-planning conversation with one worker-centered measurement commitment that the prior conversations made defensible. What is it?”

FOUR QUESTIONS

Q1 · Organizational Actions (0:10–0:20)

Tell us about a worker-centered measurement commitment your organization has already made that produces a signal the operating layer actually uses. What was the commitment, and what made it real?

Listening for: *Listen for the operating signal, not the survey program. Strong answers name a specific decision the worker-centered measurement changed - a staffing model, a capital deployment, a policy shift.*

Q2 · Blocked Actions (0:20–0:30)

What worker-centered measurement would your organization commit to if the consent, governance, or peer-cover process were defensible? What specifically is missing, and where is the bottleneck?

Listening for: *Listen for the consent process. The most useful answers are about the specific consent-and-governance gap the participant hasn't been able to close. Privacy rules (HIPAA, GDPR, works councils) are both a cover and a real constraint.*

Q3 · Field-Level Levers (0:30–0:40)

What does the field need to share, anchor, or jointly build to make this defensible at scale?

Listening for: *Listen for the cluster of asks. The strongest field-level levers tend to be (a) consent-process templates, (b) operating-defensibility benchmarks, (c) peer-organization cases.*

Q4 · Room Commits (0:40–0:50)

What does this room itself commit to that carries the work past today? Who owns the first step?

Listening for: *Listen for named owners. Who carries the work is the open question; commitments without owners drift. What surfaces here is the field-level deliverable for the day.*

PATTERNS TO REDIRECT FROM

The wellness-program drift. Worker-centered measurement often gets misread - by participants, by HR partners, by executive teams - as a wellness-program initiative. The credibility hole from the 2019–2023 wellness ROI literature still bites. If the conversation slides toward wellness framing, lightly: “What’s the part of this that has to be different from a wellness program to get funded?”

The surveillance-versus-care line. Worker-voice measurement creates new consent questions. Workers, labor reps, and works councils are increasingly distinguishing measurement-as-care from measurement-as-surveillance. The honest commitments at this table sit clearly on the care side and name how the line gets held in practice. When commitments blur the two, press for the real distinction.

The aspiration-vs-commitment gap. Senior OEHS executives are well-practiced at the language of “we should care about the whole worker.” The Solutions rotation is where the press moves past “should” toward “will.” If a participant offers an aspiration, ask: “Who commits, by when, with what evidence the commitment held?”

WHERE THIS TABLE SITS IN THE LARGER ROOM

This is the final rotation. The three lines this table lands feed Monday’s plenary readout.

CONNECTED TABLE

WHERE IT REJOINS YOURS

Solutions · Defensible Measurement Infrastructure
(Theme 1 sibling)

The sibling Solutions table on the same theme, Tech-leaning. Same room synthesis, different lens. The two readouts together carry the Theme 1 commitment language into Monday’s plenary.

Solutions · Trust as Investment Infrastructure
(Theme 4)

Trust infrastructure is what worker-voice measurement requires underneath. If your conversation reaches the consent-process or trust-conditions question, that table is the closest companion in the Solutions rotation.

Solutions · Defensible OEHS Leadership
(Theme 2)

Worker-centered measurement raises legal-exposure questions the leadership-and-legal-risks Solutions table is working on in parallel. If the consent-process or works-council question shows up in your blocked-actions window, that’s the bridge.

WHAT THE TABLE IS AND ISN’T TRYING TO PRODUCE

What this table is holding for: Be comfortable holding the worker-as-subject frame against the pull of worker-as-vector thinking. The redirect is light and frequent: “What does this measurement do for the worker rather than to them?” Working familiarity with the recent worker-voice literature and the ISO 45003 psychosocial-risk frame.

What this table isn’t trying to produce: A single agreed-on definition of worker voice - the field isn’t ready, and the room won’t produce one in fifty minutes. A clean resolution to the Tech-versus-Human measurement debates; those continue at the sibling Solutions table and into Monday’s synthesis. Vendor pitches on worker-listening platforms; when the conversation slides toward tools, return to the consent-and-governance question.

THEME 02 · GOVERNANCE, RISK & DECISION RIGHTS

Table S3 · AI Governance That Survives Audit

From principle statement to operating practice.

WHY THIS TOPIC, WHY NOW

Participants arrive at this table having likely spent two rotations on the governance question - the Tech side on AI maturity, frameworks, ethics, and strategy; the Human side on SIF/HOP decision rights and the leadership-and-legal-risks landscape. Those conversations surfaced what the field has built, what it's posturing about, and what wouldn't survive a serious external review. This table is where the conversation moves from surfacing to commitment.

DEKRA's working practice has long been built around which governance practices hold up under audit and which don't. Two facts will have surfaced: many organizations are carrying AI maturity claims they can't actually defend, and many AI deployments labeled as having "human oversight" don't have operationally meaningful review. The post-2024 regulatory environment - NIST AI RMF, ISO/IEC 42001, the EU AI Act - has raised the bar. This table asks what the field commits to so AI governance becomes defensible.

THE FRAMING QUESTION

"Walk into a 2027 audit by your insurer, a regulator, or your board's audit committee with one AI-governance commitment that would actually hold. What is it and why?"

FOUR QUESTIONS

Q1 · Organizational Actions (0:10–0:20)

Tell us about an AI-governance commitment your organization has already made that you'd defend in front of an auditor tomorrow. What was it?

Listening for: *Listen for the audit-test. Strong answers name a specific artifact, a specific decision body, a specific cadence, and the specific scrutiny it has already survived.*

Q2 · Blocked Actions (0:20–0:30)

What AI-governance commitment would your organization make if it were defensible to make it? What's blocking the move?

Listening for: *Listen for the authority bottleneck. AI governance commitments in OEHS often stall not on capability but on whether the OEHS function has the authority to set or refuse a deployment.*

Q3 · Field-Level Levers (0:30–0:40)

What does the field need to share, anchor, or jointly build to make this defensible at scale?

Listening for: *Listen for how specific the artifact is. "We need a framework" is less useful than "We need an OEHS-domain overlay on ISO/IEC 42001 that maps cleanly to ESG human-capital disclosure and to the standard D&O carrier audit categories."*

Q4 · Room Commits (0:40–0:50)

What does this room commit to? Who owns the first step, by when?

Listening for: *Listen for the red-line conversation. Some of the most consequential field-level commitments at this table will be about what the OEHS profession should collectively refuse. What surfaces here carries unusual weight.*

PATTERNS TO REDIRECT FROM

The framework-claim trap. Many organizations claim NIST AI RMF alignment, ISO/IEC 42001 readiness, or EU AI Act compliance without the operating practice underneath. If a participant cites a framework as their governance position, ask what evidence the alignment is being audited against. The honest answers are often narrower than the claim.

The compliance-theater documentation trap. AI governance in OEHS is especially vulnerable to documentation-without-decision - papers and policies that exist for audit display rather than for real operating accountability. The discipline at this table is the distinction between documentation that records a real decision and documentation that decorates a non-decision. Press for the former.

The vendor-pitch gravity. The anchor's working practice is relevant, but the table's value is the field-level commitment, not the anchor-specific approach. If participants ask about the anchor's governance methodology, name it briefly and pull back: "We can talk about the method after - what's the field-level commitment the room would carry?"

WHERE THIS TABLE SITS IN THE LARGER ROOM

This is the final rotation. The three lines this table lands feed Monday's plenary readout.

CONNECTED TABLE

WHERE IT REJOINS YOURS

Solutions · Defensible OEHS Leadership
(Theme 2 sibling)

The sibling Solutions table, Human-leaning on legal exposure and OEHS leadership governance. Same room synthesis, different lens. The two readouts together produce the Theme 2 commitment language.

Solutions · Designing Meaningful Human-in-the-Loop
(Theme 5)

Human oversight is the load-bearing piece of defensible AI governance. The Theme 5 Tech-leaning Solutions table is the design-side companion; if your table reaches the question of how to operationalize oversight, that's the mirror.

Solutions · Defensible Measurement Infrastructure
(Theme 1)

AI governance can't outrun the data layer it sits on. If your conversation reaches what data infrastructure the next defensible deployment requires, that table is the substrate companion.

WHAT THE TABLE IS AND ISN'T TRYING TO PRODUCE

What this table is holding for: Working familiarity with NIST AI RMF, ISO/IEC 42001, the EU AI Act risk categories, and the post-2024 D&O carrier audit landscape - not as expertise, just enough to recognize them. Be comfortable with the audit-test redirect: "What would survive scrutiny?" is the most useful framing in this conversation.

What this table isn't trying to produce: A defense of any specific framework. A clean resolution to the AI-policy debates - those continue at the sibling Solutions table and into Monday's synthesis. Vendor pitches on governance tools; the work here is the commitment-and-practice question underneath.

THEME 02 · GOVERNANCE, RISK & DECISION RIGHTS

Table S4 · Defensible OEHS Leadership

Governance practice before the worst day.

WHY THIS TOPIC, WHY NOW

Participants arrive at this table having likely spent two rotations on the leadership-and-governance question - the Human side on SIF/HOP decision rights and leadership-and-legal-risks; the Tech side on AI governance and the maturity-and-frameworks landscape. Those conversations surfaced where the legal environment has shifted faster than the field's practice. This table moves from surfacing to action.

Aaronberg Goldgehn's anchor is the legal-and-leadership-governance view - which OEHS-leadership decisions and practices hold up when the legal frame catches up. The post-2023 environment is materially different: personal liability has grown, ESG-disclosure rules have moved OEHS data onto the record, and AI has introduced new problems around tracing where decisions came from - problems most organizations haven't built practice around yet.

THE FRAMING QUESTION

“Walk into the worst day of your career with the governance practice you wish you had built. What is it, and what is the commitment that builds it before you need it?”

FOUR QUESTIONS

Q1 · Organizational Actions (0:10–0:20)

Tell us about an OEHS-leadership governance commitment your organization has already made that you'd teach the field to copy. What was it, and what made it hold?

Listening for: *Listen for the shift in decision rights, not just the existence of a policy. Strong answers name who decided what differently as a result.*

Q2 · Blocked Actions (0:20–0:30)

What leadership-governance commitment would you make if it were defensible to make it? What's structurally blocking the move?

Listening for: *Listen for the personal-exposure conversation. OEHS leaders often carry exposure they haven't fully named to themselves until pressed. The honest answers are often uncomfortable and disproportionately useful. The silence itself is part of the signal.*

Q3 · Field-Level Levers (0:30–0:40)

What does the field need to share, anchor, or jointly build to make this defensible at scale?

Listening for: *Listen for the insurance-industry lever. D&O carrier audit changes and OEHS-related premium pressure are emerging as one of the strongest forces shaping leadership-governance commitments, and they're underplayed in field conversations. Carrier signal is worth close attention when it surfaces.*

Q4 · Room Commits (0:40–0:50)

What does this room itself commit to? Who owns the first step, by when?

Listening for: *Listen for named owners. Leadership-governance work has the longest implementation arc of any in the Solutions rotation; commitments without owners drift the fastest.*

PATTERNS TO REDIRECT FROM

The let-legal-handle-it deferral. Counsel is reactive and limited by privilege. OEHS leadership often hands governance work to legal that it's actually carrying personally and operationally. Surface where the handoff is appropriate and where it's structural avoidance. The most useful commitments are about what OEHS leadership owns upstream of legal review.

The compliance-theater documentation trap. Some organizations document for the audit file rather than for the decision. The result is paperwork that falls apart the moment someone reads it against the operational reality. The discipline at this table is the distinction between documentation that records a real decision and documentation that decorates a non-decision.

The aspiration-vs-commitment gap. Governance work is especially prone to “we should” language. The Solutions rotation is where you press past “should” toward “will.” If a participant offers an aspiration, ask: “Who commits, by when, with what evidence the commitment held?” The discomfort of the press is the substance of the table.

WHERE THIS TABLE SITS IN THE LARGER ROOM

This is the final rotation. The three lines this table lands feed Monday's plenary readout.

CONNECTED TABLE

WHERE IT REJOINS YOURS

Solutions · AI Governance That Survives Audit
(Theme 2 sibling)

The sibling Solutions table on the same theme, Tech-leaning. The OEHS-leadership governance question and the AI-governance question meet whenever a decision rides on an AI signal; the two Solutions outputs together carry the Theme 2 commitment language.

Solutions · Learning Loops the Workforce Will Carry
(Theme 3)

Learning loops and decision rights are the same conversation from different access points. If your conversation reaches how SIF/HOP learning actually turns into changed decisions, that table is the closest companion.

Solutions · Trust as Investment Infrastructure
(Theme 4)

Underreporting is the failure mode that quietly produces leadership-legal exposure. The trust-infrastructure conversation feeds your governance conversation directly; expect a participant or two to bridge.

WHAT THE TABLE IS AND ISN'T TRYING TO PRODUCE

What this table is holding for: Working familiarity with the recent legal landscape - R v. Greater Sudbury, the Australian industrial-manslaughter laws, the post-Volkswagen U.S. pattern, and how ESG disclosure makes things discoverable. Be comfortable with the personal-exposure question; honest captures come out when the table makes it safe for participants to name what they're carrying.

What this table isn't trying to produce: A legal seminar - case citations belong as framing, not as substance. A defensive posture; the most useful captures come from participants willing to name what they can't yet defend. A clean resolution to the AI-policy debates - those continue at the sibling Solutions table and into Monday's synthesis.

THEME 03 · ADOPTION, SCALE & CHANGE

Table S5 · From Pilot to Operating Practice

Closing the second-region gap.

WHY THIS TOPIC, WHY NOW

Participants arrive at this table having likely spent two rotations on the adoption question - the Tech side on deployment use cases and pilot-to-scale infrastructure; the Human side on actionable learning loops and workforce engagement. Those conversations surfaced where OEHS technology stalls between pilot and production - and what the field hasn't yet built to close that gap.

CompScience's working practice has been built around the scale economics of computer-vision deployment and OEHS-technology adoption broadly. Two facts will have surfaced: most OEHS technology deployments stall because the conditions that made the pilot succeed don't carry over; and most organizations underinvest in those conditions, then read the scale-up failure as a technology problem rather than a design problem. This table asks what specific commitments the room makes to redesign the pilot-to-scale setup.

THE FRAMING QUESTION

“Walk into your next OEHS-technology pilot design meeting with one commitment that the conversations you just heard would make defensible. What makes scale-up survivable?”

FOUR QUESTIONS

Q1 · Organizational Actions (0:10–0:20)

Tell us about a pilot-to-scale commitment your organization has already made that produced an OEHS deployment that survived past the second region. What was the commitment, and what made it real?

Listening for: *Listen for the design discipline at the front end, not the heroic effort at the back end. Strong answers name a specific decision made before the pilot launched that prevented a scale failure later.*

Q2 · Blocked Actions (0:20–0:30)

What pilot-to-scale commitment would you make if it were defensible to make it? What's blocking the move?

Listening for: *Listen for the funding-model question. Pilots get capital funding; production deployments have to be absorbed by operating budgets. That transition is one of the most common scale failure points.*

Q3 · Field-Level Levers (0:30–0:40)

What does the field need to share, anchor, or jointly build to make this defensible at scale?

Listening for: *Listen for how specific the artifact is. The strongest asks tend to be about shared case material with honest failure-mode readouts, not just success stories.*

Q4 · Room Commits (0:40–0:50)

What does this room itself commit to that carries the work? Who owns the next step?

Listening for: *Listen for named owners. Pilot-to-scale work has a long implementation arc; if the room reaches the named-deliverable-named-owner moment, that's what the field needs most.*

PATTERNS TO REDIRECT FROM

The “champion left” explanation reflex. Many scale-up failures get explained with “the regional champion left.” That’s partly true and partly a way to avoid the harder question: why was the deployment dependent on a single person? Press past the departure framing toward the design question: what would the deployment have needed to survive any single person leaving?

The vendor-pitch gravity. The anchor’s working practice on computer-vision pilot-to-scale is relevant, but the table’s value is the field-level commitment, not the platform-specific approach. If participants ask about the platform, name it briefly: “We can talk about the platform after – what’s the field-level commitment underneath?”

The successful-pilot overclaim. Pilots that look successful in their first region often have features that don’t carry over – dedicated people, executive attention, white-glove vendor support, a hand-picked site. If a participant cites a successful pilot, ask what conditions the second region didn’t have. The honest answer is usually the substantive capture.

WHERE THIS TABLE SITS IN THE LARGER ROOM

This is the final rotation. The three lines this table lands feed Monday’s plenary readout.

CONNECTED TABLE**WHERE IT REJOINS YOURS**

Solutions · Learning Loops the Workforce Will Carry
(Theme 3 sibling)

The sibling Solutions table on the same theme, Human-leaning on learning and engagement. Adoption-at-scale and learning loops are the same loop from different access points; the two Solutions outputs together carry the Theme 3 commitment language.

Solutions · The Investment Case That Holds
(Theme 4)

Scale-up funding is often the binding constraint. The business-case Solutions table is asking what makes the next investment defensible; your table is asking what makes the existing investment survive. The two meet at the operating-budget transition.

Solutions · Designing Meaningful Human-in-the-Loop
(Theme 5)

Scaling AI-augmented OEHS deployments runs straight into the meaningful-oversight question at production volumes. If your conversation reaches the production-volume reality, that table is the design-side companion.

WHAT THE TABLE IS AND ISN’T TRYING TO PRODUCE

What this table is holding for: Be comfortable holding the design-not-technology frame against the pull of the technology-comparison frame. “What’s the design commitment underneath the technology?” is the question this conversation returns to most. Working familiarity with the pilot-design literature in adjacent fields – clinical, manufacturing, software.

What this table isn’t trying to produce: A pilot-design framework – the deliverable is what the field commits to, not which framework to adopt. A clean resolution to the pilot-design debates; those continue at the sibling Solutions table and into Monday’s synthesis. Vendor pitches; when the conversation slides toward platforms, return to the design discipline underneath.

THEME 03 · ADOPTION, SCALE & CHANGE

Table S6 · Learning Loops the Workforce Will Carry

*Design that closes inside the operating cycle.***WHY THIS TOPIC, WHY NOW**

Participants arrive at this table having likely spent two rotations on the adoption-and-learning question - the Human side on actionable learning loops and engagement; the Tech side on deployment use cases and pilot-to-scale infrastructure. Those conversations surfaced where learning loops close inside the operating cycle and where they produce reports that change nothing. This table is where the conversation moves from surfacing to commitment.

Stantec's working practice has been built around the design discipline of bringing the workforce into the design room - not the rollout, the design - for the systems that affect their work. Two facts will have surfaced: most OEHS learning systems produce findings everyone agrees with, and nothing changes; and the workforce-engagement layer most organizations treat as a communications problem is actually a design problem. This table asks how we design with the worker, not for them.

THE FRAMING QUESTION

“Walk into your next OEHS-deployment conversation with one commitment about the worker role in the design that the prior conversations would make defensible. What is it?”

FOUR QUESTIONS**Q1 · Organizational Actions** (0:10–0:20)

Tell us about a learning-loop or workforce-engagement commitment your organization has already made that produced a real change in operating practice. What was the commitment, and what made it real?

Listening for: *Listen for the change in an operating decision, not the program description. Strong answers name a specific decision the workforce-engagement work changed - a staffing model, a procedure rewrite, a capital deployment, a vendor criterion.*

Q2 · Blocked Actions (0:20–0:30)

What learning-loop or workforce-engagement commitment would your organization make if it were defensible to make it? What's blocking the move?

Listening for: *Listen for the authority-and-cadence gap. The honest answers are about who has authority over which signal at what cadence - not about whether the organization “values” worker input.*

Q3 · Field-Level Levers (0:30–0:40)

What does the field need to share, anchor, or jointly build to make this defensible at scale?

Listening for: *Listen for the language gap. The field doesn't yet have shared language for what makes a learning loop “actionable” as opposed to “thorough.” The strongest asks tend to live in that language gap; the words the field is reaching for are themselves the signal.*

Q4 · Room Commits (0:40–0:50)

What does this room itself commit to? Who owns the first step, by when?

Listening for: *Listen for named owners. Workforce-engagement work has the longest culture-change arc of any in the Solutions rotation; commitments without owners drift the fastest.*

PATTERNS TO REDIRECT FROM

The “they don’t understand the risk” reflex. When participants frame engagement gaps as “workers don’t understand,” the alternative reading is almost always available and more useful: workers may understand the risk and the work differently than the organization assumes, and the gap is information about the work, not a deficit in the worker. The Solutions discipline turns this reading into commitments: “What would you commit to changing about how the work is designed if you took that reading seriously?”

The survey-as-action trap. Workforce-engagement work in OEHS often collapses into engagement-survey programs that produce scores without changing operating conditions. If a participant cites a survey-based commitment, ask what specifically the survey changed about how decisions get made. The honest answer is often “less than I thought,” which is the substance of the capture.

The aspiration-vs-commitment gap. Workforce-engagement language slides into aspiration faster than most. The Solutions rotation is where you press past “should” toward “will.” If a participant offers an aspiration, ask: “Who commits, by when, with what evidence the commitment held?” Discomfort under the press is the substance of the table.

WHERE THIS TABLE SITS IN THE LARGER ROOM

This is the final rotation. The three lines this table lands feed Monday’s plenary readout.

CONNECTED TABLE**WHERE IT REJOINS YOURS****Solutions · From Pilot to Operating Practice
(Theme 3 sibling)**

The sibling Solutions table, Tech-leaning. Workforce engagement is the most under-priced scale-up condition; the two Solutions outputs together produce the Theme 3 commitment language.

**Solutions · Developing the 2030 Practitioner
(Theme 5)**

Workforce development and workforce engagement are the same arc viewed at different time horizons. If your conversation reaches how the field develops practitioners who design with workers rather than for them, that table is the closest companion.

**Solutions · Trust as Investment
Infrastructure
(Theme 4)**

Engagement and trust go together. If your conversation reaches why workers aren’t telling you something - or won’t engage with a rollout despite the communications effort - that table is the trust-infrastructure companion.

WHAT THE TABLE IS AND ISN’T TRYING TO PRODUCE

What this table is holding for: Be comfortable holding the workforce-as-source-of-information frame against the workforce-as-resistance frame. “What are they seeing that the rollout deck isn’t?” is the question this conversation returns to most. Working familiarity with the rules-as-written versus rules-as-followed framing, and the work-as-imagined versus work-as-done distinction.

What this table isn’t trying to produce: A defense of safety culture as a frame (the room is past that). A specific change-management framework. A clean resolution to the pilot-design debates; those continue at the sibling Solutions table and into Monday’s synthesis.

THEME 04 · TRUST, CULTURE & THE BUSINESS CASE

Table S7 · The Investment Case That Holds

What gets funded after the wellness-program credibility hole.

WHY THIS TOPIC, WHY NOW

Participants arrive at this table having likely spent two rotations on the trust-and-business-case question - the Tech side on what tools are genuinely new and what makes an investment case defensible; the Human side on trust-and-psychological-safety infrastructure and the cultural conditions that have to hold under AI-driven work.

Evotix's working practice has been built around the translation problem - from operating need to executive funding decision. Two facts will have surfaced: most OEHS-technology investment cases get built around ROI claims that don't survive post-wellness-program scrutiny; and the financial signal that actually wins the CFO argument - TCOR movement, retention, workers' comp loss-ratio shift, SEC human-capital reporting, ESG disclosure - is rarely in the case OEHS leaders bring forward. This table asks what business-case commitments would clear the post-2023 credibility bar.

THE FRAMING QUESTION

“Walk into your CFO's office in Q1 2027 with one OEHS-technology investment case that clears the credibility bar. What is the investment and what does your organization do?”

FOUR QUESTIONS

Q1 · Organizational Actions (0:10–0:20)

Tell us about an OEHS-technology investment case your organization built in the last twenty-four months that the finance team will defend. What was the case, and what financial signal made it land?

Listening for: *Listen for the specific financial signal. Strong answers name TCOR movement, retention cost numbers, a shift in workers' comp loss ratio, an ESG-disclosure consequence, an SEC human-capital metric.*

Q2 · Blocked Actions (0:20–0:30)

What investment would you make the case for if it were defensible? What's blocking the case?

Listening for: *The wellness-program credibility hole will surface. When it does, what matters is what specifically the organization is now skeptical of - and what the OEHS-technology case has to prove to clear the bar. The honest answers are the substance of the table.*

Q3 · Field-Level Levers (0:30–0:40)

What does the field need to share, anchor, or jointly build to make this defensible at scale?

Listening for: *Listen for how specific the artifact or evidence is. The strongest asks tend to be about shared evidence - a peer case library with anonymized financial outcomes - rather than shared templates.*

Q4 · Room Commits (0:40–0:50)

What does this room itself commit to? Who owns the first step, by when?

Listening for: *Listen for named owners. Business-case work is where the room's authority is highest - these are CFO-grade conversations the participants themselves can lead.*

PATTERNS TO REDIRECT FROM

The wellness-program ghost. Most participants lived through the wellness-program credibility collapse, and the frame still carries baggage. If the conversation starts to feel like a wellness pitch in OEHS-technology clothing, name it: “What’s the part of this case that has to be different from the 2015 wellness program to actually get funded?” The honest answer is the substance of the capture.

The ROI-overclaim gravity. Vendor case materials routinely overclaim ROI through cherry-picked time horizons, ignored opportunity cost, or downstream-benefit claims that don’t survive scrutiny. The discipline at this table is to surface where participants’ own internal cases have had to work narrower than the vendor headline. Press for the honest internal version.

The vendor-pitch gravity. The anchor’s working practice is relevant, but the table’s value is the field-level commitment, not the platform-specific approach. If participants ask about the platform, name it briefly and pull back: “We can talk about the platform after – what’s the commitment underneath?”

WHERE THIS TABLE SITS IN THE LARGER ROOM

This is the final rotation. The three lines this table lands feed Monday’s plenary readout.

CONNECTED TABLE**WHERE IT REJOINS YOURS**

**Solutions · Trust as Investment
Infrastructure
(Theme 4 sibling)**

The sibling Solutions table on the same theme, Human-leaning. Trust infrastructure is what gets purchased when the business case lands; the two Solutions outputs together produce the Theme 4 commitment language.

**Solutions · Defensible Measurement
Infrastructure
(Theme 1)**

Business cases sit downstream of analytics. The Theme 1 Tech-leaning Solutions table is the evidence-base companion; if your table reaches the analytical-defensibility question, that’s the mirror.

**Solutions · From Pilot to Operating Practice
(Theme 3)**

Scale-up funding is often the binding constraint on the business case. The pilot-to-scale Solutions table is the operational companion to your funding conversation.

WHAT THE TABLE IS AND ISN’T TRYING TO PRODUCE

What this table is holding for: Be comfortable with executive-financial language at the level a CFO uses: TCOR, retention cost, workers’ comp loss ratio, SEC human-capital reporting, ESG-disclosure frameworks, insurance-carrier audit categories. Be aware of the wellness-program credibility hole and what an OEHS-technology case has to do differently from a wellness case to clear it.

What this table isn’t trying to produce: A defense of any specific investment category (the room is past that). A single agreed-on ROI methodology – the field doesn’t have one and the room won’t produce one. Vendor pitches; the work here is to surface the commitment-and-evidence substance underneath the platform layer.

THEME 04 · TRUST, CULTURE & THE BUSINESS CASE

Table S8 · Trust as Investment Infrastructure

The foundation every other commitment builds on.

WHY THIS TOPIC, WHY NOW

Participants arrive at this table having likely spent two rotations on the trust-and-culture question - the Human side on trust-and-psychological-safety infrastructure and safety culture for 2026 and beyond; the Tech side on new tools and the post-wellness-program business case. Those conversations surfaced where reporting culture and honest engagement hold up, and where AI-and-monitoring deployment is changing what workers can reasonably trust.

WorkRightNW's working practice has been built around the trust-and-cultural-infrastructure layer of OEHS operating practice. Two facts will have surfaced: most organizations manage psychological safety as a survey construct rather than an operating condition, and the operating evidence often contradicts the dashboard; and AI-driven worker monitoring is entering workplaces faster than the trust infrastructure can carry it. This table asks what would make it defensible at scale.

THE FRAMING QUESTION

“Walk into your 2027 OEHS-deployment design conversation with one trust-infrastructure commitment that the prior conversations would make defensible. What is it?”

FOUR QUESTIONS

Q1 · Organizational Actions (0:10–0:20)

Tell us about a trust-infrastructure commitment your organization has already made that you'd teach the field to copy. What made it real?

Listening for: *Listen for the operating evidence, not the culture story. Strong answers name a specific cadence, a specific authority, a specific pattern of consequences, or a specific consent-process decision. “Our culture is strong” is not data.*

Q2 · Blocked Actions (0:20–0:30)

What trust-infrastructure commitment would you make if it were defensible? What's blocking the move?

Listening for: *Listen for the surveillance-versus-trust honesty question. Several participants will have organizations deploying worker-monitoring technology while running psych-safety programs at the same time.*

Q3 · Field-Level Levers (0:30–0:40)

What does the field need to share, anchor, or jointly build to make this defensible at scale?

Listening for: *Listen for the AI-deployment-and-trust cluster. The strongest asks tend to be about what conditions an AI-monitoring deployment has to meet to preserve the reporting culture the organization has built.*

Q4 · Room Commits (0:40–0:50)

What does this room itself commit to? Who owns the first step?

Listening for: *Listen for named owners. Trust-infrastructure work has a long implementation arc and the highest leverage on every other OEHS program; commitments without owners drift the fastest.*

PATTERNS TO REDIRECT FROM

The culture-talk drift. Psychological safety and trust-infrastructure conversations collapse fastest into warm agreement about culture. “Our culture is good” is not data. The Solutions discipline is to convert culture language into operating-evidence language: “Say the culture is good - what’s the specific operating signal that tells you so, and what’s the commitment that protects it?”

The surveillance-vs-trust honesty problem. Several participants will be running organizations with simultaneous psych-safety programs and AI-monitoring deployments. The tension is real and the honest conversation about it is rare. The most consequential captures will come from the participants who can speak to the tension directly; surface and protect those moments.

The aspiration-vs-commitment gap. Trust-language slides into aspiration faster than most. The Solutions rotation is where you press past “should” toward “will.” If a participant offers an aspiration, ask: “Who commits, by when, with what evidence the commitment held?”

WHERE THIS TABLE SITS IN THE LARGER ROOM

This is the final rotation. The three lines this table lands feed Monday’s plenary readout.

CONNECTED TABLE

WHERE IT REJOINS YOURS

Solutions · The Investment Case That Holds (Theme 4 sibling)

The sibling Solutions table, Tech-leaning. Trust infrastructure is what the business case rests on - and increasingly part of what gets purchased when the case lands. The two Solutions outputs together produce the Theme 4 commitment language.

Solutions · AI Governance That Survives Audit (Theme 2)

AI governance and trust infrastructure meet whenever an AI deployment touches the reporting culture. If your conversation reaches what conditions a deployment has to meet to preserve trust, that table is the governance-side companion.

Solutions · Worker Voice in the Measurement Frame (Theme 1)

Worker-voice measurement and trust infrastructure go together. If your conversation reaches the consent-process or workforce-voice question, that table is the closest companion in the Solutions rotation.

WHAT THE TABLE IS AND ISN'T TRYING TO PRODUCE

What this table is holding for: Be comfortable holding the operating-evidence frame against the pull of the culture-story frame. “What is the operating signal underneath the culture description?” is the question this conversation returns to most.

What this table isn't trying to produce: A defense of psychological safety as a construct (the room is past that). A clean resolution to the AI-monitoring debates - the field's position is still emerging; the room can do real work without forcing consensus. A methodology walkthrough; Solutions discipline applies at the partner's own chair.

THEME 05 · SKILLS & THE HUMAN-TECH INTERFACE

Table S9 · Designing Meaningful Human-in-the-Loop

Past pro-forma oversight, into operating discipline.

WHY THIS TOPIC, WHY NOW

Participants arrive at this table having likely spent two rotations on the human-tech-interface question - the Tech side on human-in-the-loop design and preparing the profession; the Human side on critical thinking under AI and workforce development. Those conversations surfaced where human-in-the-loop deployments are operationally meaningful and where they're pro-forma - and where the credentialing-and-skills pipeline is or isn't producing the practitioner the interface requires.

MakuSafe's working practice has been built around the deployment realities of AI-augmented OEHS work - wearables, predictive risk scoring, and pulling model outputs into the practitioner's workflow. Two facts will have surfaced: most human-in-the-loop deployments are pro-forma - a human signs off on outputs they can't meaningfully evaluate at the cadence required; and the practitioners who can do meaningful oversight on AI-augmented OEHS work aren't being developed fast enough.

THE FRAMING QUESTION

“Walk into your 2027 AI-deployment audit with one human-in-the-loop commitment that would actually be defensible. What is it?”

FOUR QUESTIONS

Q1 · Organizational Actions (0:10–0:20)

Tell us about a human-in-the-loop design commitment your organization has already made that produced meaningful oversight.

Listening for: *Listen for how specific the design discipline is. Strong answers name a particular workflow choice that forced the human to engage, a particular friction the organization built in, or a particular protection for review capacity.*

Q2 · Blocked Actions (0:20–0:30)

What human-in-the-loop commitment would you make if it were defensible? What's blocking it?

Listening for: *Listen for the cadence-versus-capability gap. Many deployments fail meaningful oversight at the production-volume layer; the honest answers are about whether the reviewer has the time and the judgment to actually second-guess the model.*

Q3 · Field-Level Levers (0:30–0:40)

What does the field need to share, anchor, or jointly build to make this defensible at scale?

Listening for: *Listen for the credentialing-and-design pairing. The strongest asks tend to pair a design-side artifact (workflow standard, peer library) with a workforce-side artifact (credentialing requirement, training standard).*

Q4 · Room Commits (0:40–0:50)

What does this room itself commit to? Who owns the first step?

Listening for: *Listen for named owners. Human-in-the-loop work spans both deployment design and workforce development; commitments without owners across both areas drift the fastest.*

PATTERNS TO REDIRECT FROM

The signature-as-oversight trap. A human signature on AI output is not the same as meaningful oversight. Some deployments treat the signature as the compliance artifact and back off the operating discipline entirely. The Solutions discipline is to surface commitments that produce operationally meaningful review, not commitments that just produce a signature. Press for what the review actually does.

The reviewer-capability erosion question. The 2025 cognitive-offloading research and the broader automation-complacency literature both predict that reviewers lose the judgment they need to overrule the model the longer they review at scale. The honest captures here name what the organization is doing about reviewer-skill preservation - or admit it isn't doing enough yet.

The vendor-pitch gravity. The anchor's working practice on wearables-and-AI is relevant, but the table's value is the field-level commitment, not the platform-specific approach. If participants ask about the platform, name it briefly and pull back: "We can talk about the platform after - what's the design-discipline commitment underneath?"

WHERE THIS TABLE SITS IN THE LARGER ROOM

This is the final rotation. The three lines this table lands feed Monday's plenary readout.

CONNECTED TABLE

WHERE IT REJOINS YOURS

Solutions · Developing the 2030 Practitioner (Theme 5 sibling)

The sibling Solutions table on the same theme, Human-leaning on workforce development. Meaningful human-in-the-loop requires reviewers with judgment the credentialing system has to produce; the two Solutions outputs together carry the Theme 5 commitment language.

Solutions · AI Governance That Survives Audit (Theme 2)

Human-in-the-loop is the load-bearing piece of defensible AI governance. The Theme 2 Tech-leaning Solutions table is the audit-defensibility companion to your design-discipline conversation.

Solutions · From Pilot to Operating Practice (Theme 3)

Scaling AI-augmented deployments runs straight into the production-volume reality your table addresses. If your conversation reaches the scale-versus-oversight tension, that table is the operational companion.

WHAT THE TABLE IS AND ISN'T TRYING TO PRODUCE

What this table is holding for: Working familiarity with the human-in-the-loop literature - EU AI Act requirements, how NIST AI RMF treats it, the automation-complacency research, and the Microsoft Research 2025 cognitive-offloading work.

What this table isn't trying to produce: A defense of human-in-the-loop as a principle (the room is past that). A specific design framework - the deliverable is what the field commits to in shared practice. A clean resolution to the workforce-development debates; those continue at the sibling Solutions table and into Monday's synthesis.

THEME 05 · SKILLS & THE HUMAN-TECH INTERFACE

Table S10 · Developing the 2030 Practitioner

What the field commits to building, and who builds it.

WHY THIS TOPIC, WHY NOW

Participants arrive at this table having likely spent two rotations on the human-tech-interface question - the Human side on critical thinking under AI and workforce development; the Tech side on human-in-the-loop design and preparing the profession. Those conversations surfaced where the workforce pipeline is under-producing the practitioner the next decade requires, and where the credentialing ecosystem is repositioning faster than we can describe what it needs.

Bowers Management Analytics' anchor at this table is workforce development; Keith's experience will help us navigate how the field develops the practitioner who can hold meaningful judgment under AI tooling, engage with workers as subjects of risk rather than carriers of hazard, and carry the human-tech-interface skills the late 2020s require. Two facts will have surfaced: the academic OEHS pipeline has been shrinking for over a decade while the scope of the work has gotten wider; and AI-fluency expectations are now showing up in credential conversations.

THE FRAMING QUESTION

“Walk into your 2027 hiring conversation with one workforce-development commitment that the prior conversations would make defensible. What is it?”

FOUR QUESTIONS

Q1 · Organizational Actions (0:10–0:20)

Tell us about a workforce-development commitment your organization has already made that's producing the practitioner you need. What made it produce a practitioner the field could copy?

Listening for: *Listen for the specific competency the commitment produces. Strong answers name an operational capability the practitioner can actually demonstrate - a deployment they can evaluate, a worker conversation they can hold honestly.*

Q2 · Blocked Actions (0:20–0:30)

What workforce-development commitment would your organization make if it were defensible? What's blocking the move?

Listening for: *Listen for the executive-decision-rights question. The pipeline problem is partly academic, partly credentialing, and partly inside the room's own decision rights on hiring, development, and investment.*

Q3 · Field-Level Levers (0:30–0:40)

What does the field need to share, anchor, or jointly build to make this defensible at scale?

Listening for: *Listen for how specific the credentialing-modernization ask is. The strongest asks tend to be artifact-specific - an AI-fluency competency layer, a deployment-experience credentialing requirement, a recognition standard for non-traditional pathways.*

Q4 · Room Commits (0:40–0:50)

What does this room itself commit to? Who owns the first step?

Listening for: *Listen for the profession-readout. This is the table whose output most directly feeds the leadership readout.*

PATTERNS TO REDIRECT FROM

The credentialism reflex. Senior practitioners often default to defending existing credentials as the answer to pipeline pressure. That's partly right and partly path-dependent. Press the room: which credentials are actually predicting practitioner performance in human-tech-interface work, and which are just inherited? The honest answer is more useful than the defensive one.

The academia-blaming detour. It's easy and partly fair to put the pipeline problem on the shrinking of academic OEHS programs; it's also incomplete. The executives in this room have decision rights over hiring, development investment, deployment-experience design, and what gets funded at universities. If the conversation drifts toward pushing the problem outward, redirect: "What's in this room's decision rights?"

The AI-fluency overclaim. "AI-fluent" is becoming a credential-marketing term faster than the field has defined what it actually means operationally. If a participant cites AI-fluency as a commitment, ask what it should let the practitioner do that they currently can't. The honest answer is the substantive ground.

WHERE THIS TABLE SITS IN THE LARGER ROOM

This is the final rotation. The three lines this table lands feed Monday's plenary readout.

CONNECTED TABLE**WHERE IT REJOINS YOURS**

Solutions · Designing Meaningful Human-in-the-Loop
(Theme 5 sibling)

The sibling Solutions table, Tech-leaning on design discipline. Meaningful oversight requires the practitioner your table's commitments produce; the two Solutions outputs together carry the Theme 5 commitment language and the professional-body readout.

Solutions · Learning Loops the Workforce Will Carry
(Theme 3)

Workforce development and workforce engagement are the same arc at different time horizons. If your conversation reaches how the field develops practitioners who design with workers, that table is the closest companion.

Solutions · Worker Voice in the Measurement Frame
(Theme 1)

The 2030 practitioner has to be able to hold the worker-as-subject frame against the pull of the worker-as-carrier frame. If your conversation reaches the measurement-judgment question, that table is the closest companion.

WHAT THE TABLE IS AND ISN'T TRYING TO PRODUCE

What this table is holding for: Working familiarity with the credentialing landscape, the BLS occupational outlook for OEHS roles, and the recent conversation on AI-fluency standards in adjacent professions.

What this table isn't trying to produce: A defense of any specific credential (the room is past that). A single agreed-on theory of the OEHS practitioner of the future - the deliverable is what executives commit to and what the field needs the credentialing ecosystem to do. A clean resolution to the design-discipline debates; those continue at the sibling Solutions table.