

PROPOSAL FOR SA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, WATER AND  
NATURAL RESOURCES

**WHO PAYS?**  
**AGREEING FAIR SHARES IN INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING:**  
**SOUTH EASTERN DRAINAGE**

PROCESS DESIGN OVERVIEW:  
CAN A COMMUNITY SOLVE A COMPLEX PROBLEM RATHER THAN HAVE A  
SOLUTION IMPOSED?

Overview

Many areas of public administration are viewed superficially as areas where “*the government should pay*”. This is most notably the case when government has historically made an investment in the asset, as is the case with the South East Drainage Network.

Government will occasionally judge that some assets are not public goods in the pure sense of the word, as the benefits provided fall disproportionately on a subset of the population rather than the whole.

In this specific situation, it is possible to argue that numerous subsets exist: there are those who hold land which grows in agricultural value, there are those who benefit from the wider agricultural industry, there are services who benefit from having a wealthier economy, and there are those who gain via the environmental benefits.

Weighing the comparative benefits of the above (non-exhaustive) list of beneficiaries necessarily opens up all possible decisions to criticism when made by an elected representative as there is a naturally subjective element. It is suggested that if a diverse group of everyday people from the community – likely spanning all points of view above - can find common ground as to how they wish to solve the problem that this may provide a solution which more people can trust.

Background and Context

The South East Drainage System (SED) comprises 2589kms of drains and floodways.

It has been built progressively from 1863 with significant expansion from 1949-72, largely in the lower southeast. The expansion in the upper southeast has occurred largely in the last 20 years. This

gap in age creates a distinct gap in likely renewal costs across the community with one geographic 'half' of the asset considerably older.

The drainage system exists for both environmental and agricultural reasons which are challenging to separate. Different motivations for different interest groups (and individual citizens) will therefore exist. The primary industry sector of the South East is a contributor to the regions approx. \$3bn contribution to State GDP, the drainage system plays a part in sustaining this productivity, while a primary environmental benefit is the delivery of water flows to 40,000 hectares in the upper southeast (DFW 2011)<sup>1</sup>

Across the long history, a wide range of funding models have been attempted spanning different rating methods, community shares and betterment approaches. This history creates an impediment to the concept of fairness as equivalent users may have made significant contributions under entirely different funding regimes and with quite different commitments made over time. Some landholders have also undertaken their own works (both formally as an "in kind" levy contribution, and informally for practical reasons, most notably following a 1981 flood).

By one measure, past funding measures can be judged successful, as they delivered the funding required to pay for an extensive program of works. However, past approaches appear to have failed a 'fairness test' (in the view of NDF) creating a constant impetus for review: that is the fundamental task to be given to a panel of everyday citizens spanning the entire affected region.

### Project Objective

The objective of this deliberative process is to provide the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation an actionable recommendation as to how to pay for maintenance of the drainage system. In lay terms, this will be a regional levy mechanism of some sort.

As with all jury-style processes, the implicit related objective is to design a process with sufficient rigour as to withstand (understandable) sceptical scrutiny: one which visibly cannot be influenced by a politician, an interest group or financial interest. Transparency of method is one part of this: the design itself must be shared prior to the commencement of the panel's deliberations. Equally, the role of NDF as non-partisan operators with no interest in the issue nor even further work with the agency must be emphasised. Citizens have grown wary of consultants and experts delivering the result which government pays for in order to earn further work. The Foundation's own brutal self-interest – to prove that citizens can solve problems for themselves if given the scope to do so – should be openly shared.

It should be noted that deliberative processes do not attempt to turn citizens into subject matter experts, in much the same way that criminal trials do not turn them into forensic experts. The panel's task is to provide the Minister with **clarity of intent** regarding what the community view as the fairest and most effective option for paying for the infrastructure. This may require limited

---

<sup>1</sup> Department for Water (DFW), *Upper South East Program – Project Review and Closure Report*, (Department for Water, 2011)

technical refinement, and if so, a sample of citizen panellists should be retained in an oversight capacity.

Success is a **clear consensus emerging from a visually representative group immersed in the issue**, in this instance that group must specifically include those engaged in agriculture, those from the more urban areas such as Mt Gambier, and a geographic spread around the region (upper and lower regions). Equally importantly, success involves that group earning the trust of the wider community and a broad spectrum of active interest groups through mainstream press coverage *from the outset of the process* before any possible direction of their recommendations is known (even to them).

Where the Government assesses that recommendations made by the jury are of merit and supported by evidence then they would ideally feel empowered to act.

The process serves to empower elected representatives who are otherwise subject to the non-deliberative response of 'vox pop democracy' driven through the media. However, the trade-off is an "uncontrolled" result – the community selects experts of their own choosing and the Foundation will fiercely protect the neutrality of information provision. Government agencies, expert groups, interest groups, community groups and lobbyists will be invited to make their case, but the extent of the role is in the hands of the randomly selected citizens, not organisers, facilitators or the Government.

A deliberative process must be focused on fairness, long term viability and public trust.

#### About The newDemocracy Foundation

The newDemocracy Foundation (NDF) is a not-for-profit research group, with a particular focus on best practice citizen engagement and innovations in democratic structures. NDF believes that many consultation processes consist of feedback forum events largely attended by interest groups and hyper-interested individuals.

Such processes do not result in communities feeling they have had a say. In contrast, NDF's proposal is to provide a jury-style process which enables a more representative section of the community to deliberate and find a consensus response. By combining the three elements of random selection, the provision of time and access to all information, and independently facilitated forums for dialogue, a much more robust and publicly trusted outcome can be obtained which can assist governments in achieving public acceptance of hard tradeoffs.

NDF provides design frameworks for public deliberation and overall innovation in democratic models. **Our research and advocacy is focussed on identifying less adversarial, more deliberative and more inclusive public decision-making processes.** Our services are provided on a cost recovery basis - consistent with our structure as a not-for-profit research Foundation, with services provided pro bono on occasion. We are not a think tank and hold no policy views. We also commission independent third-party research which occurs in parallel to the process in order to ensure robustness and to capture the potential for improvements to existing democratic processes.

### Rationale: Growing Trust through Public Accountability and Transparency

The newDemocracy Foundation contends that if the public was told that 20-30 of their fellow citizens had reached consensus around a given solution after studying detailed information and hearing from subject-matter experts of their own choosing, then the community is more likely to trust this process over the announcement of the *exact same outcomes* delivered by a Premier, a Minister, a Lord Mayor, or an individual expert. Public trust in government has declined and we respond to this.

In a murder trial, public trust is placed in a jury's verdict, without looking at each piece of evidence, because a trusted group of citizens was given sufficient time and access to information – and was free from outside influences (or even the perception of such influences). There is ample research evidence that supports that this same model can be applied to public decisions in general. More than 1100 case studies have shown that, by giving a representative panel time and information upon which to deliberate, stronger public engagement is achieved – as well as higher quality decisions (Diversity Theorem).

It should be noted that traditional models of community engagement do not contribute substantially to acceptance of the final decision: those with a specific interest and the loudest voices tend to dominate – one wins, others lose. The newDemocracy Foundation will encourage all these interest groups to make their cases to the jury so that these panels are heard without having a disproportionate influence.

### Methodology

It is proposed that a **Community Panel for SE Drainage (CP)** of **24 participants** would be convened for three weekends amounting to **six days** of in-person deliberations. The participant count is slightly fluid to allow for the statistical profile match to the Census to be maintained even if there is a shortfall in a single category.

There is negligible statistical impact (in confidence level and confidence interval) on representation within that range. It is notable that recent research from Princeton on the 'wisdom of crowds' highlights the greater capacity of small groups rather than large in complex situations (read more: <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/281/1784/20133305> )

The scheduling is different from previously designed and tested approaches to reflect the unique nature of the issue: a single panel must span an issue which is physically spread over a 200km diameter, and must be exposed to a range of infrastructure and affected users across this geographic range. As such, considerable time will be needed when citizens meet, and respect must be paid for the travel time required. For this reason, three intensive weekends are planned where panellists will be given the option of on-site accommodation. A considerable process benefit accrues in the cohesion and extra time for discussion this provides outside of the formally scheduled hours.

NDF has previously operated processes with accommodation requirements and notes that this reinforces the need for very clear and direct communication of the substantive nature of the process

by the Minister in the early communications. The added support of the Premier would be of considerable assistance.

Again focusing on the local nature of a regional process, it is recommended that three different locations are used: Naracoorte (geographically central), Mt Gambier (population centre accounting for ~50% of citizens) and Bordertown (central to the northern region).

The participant number is designed to be sufficiently large to achieve the goals of descriptive representation: does a diverse community look at the panel and see “people like me” involved in the decision, which NDF suggests occurs insufficiently in our parliaments. In this case, does the stratification applied mean the community see those working in regional centres (50%), those working directly in agriculture (min 20%), people from all around the region (north and south proportionate to population), the old and young (30% under 34), male and female, and someone who identifies as Aboriginal (min 1 citizen)? While a 12/16 person jury can be easier to work with, the descriptive goal outlined here cannot be met with that number of participants.

The jury will be complemented by a range of traditional engagement techniques (surveys, websites, forums, interviews, Advisory Committees, formal submissions etc) to build on the history and knowledge found in the actively engaged community. This encourages self-selected groups to discuss and share with a view to making a submission to be considered by the jury of their peers. Ideally these will be delivered by the same facilitator as DEWNR retains for the CP process, or if separate, that they attend common meetings to ensure continuity between the engagements i.e that these processes contribute to the panel’s deliberations.

Critically, it is proposed to convene an earlier session of stakeholders and interest groups (spanning the full spectrum of views) to allow for them to be briefed on detail on the process and interrogate our methodology (and neutrality): this is essential to building confidence in the process. It is proposed that this group would be given the opportunity to prepare written materials for the community panel and to work together to agree a panel of experts the jurors should be exposed to in one session. This is designed to address the simplistic criticism *“if you haven’t heard from person X, how can the process be well informed?”*

In addition to the process above, the successful facilitator will be strongly encouraged to include a specific Speed Dialogue session for the NRM Board and SE Drainage Board to allow for both familiarisation and the sharing of decades of experience in a conversational setting. The use of speed dialogue (small groups rotating among all participants for ~8 minutes each) encourages the sharing of a wide range of perspectives and experiences and a high volume of panellist questioning which accelerates their learning and understanding.

Random selection is the key tool used to identify participants as a means of securing a descriptively representative sample of the community. Stratification will be used to ensure a mix (matched to Census data) by the variables described above. This is not claimed as a “perfect” method, but it delivers more representative sample than any other community process.

In a comparatively small sample, the wider community will clearly see “people like me” in a sample drawn evenly in this way. Descriptively, we will secure people from all walks of life.

Invitations to participate in the CP will be extended to a randomly selected sample of **7,000** addresses drawn from across the SE NRM Region (bordered in the north by Keith and in the south by Mt Gambier and the east by the SA/Vic Border).

The first preference source of address details is the Office of Land Titles, with an alternate option being the use of proportionate samples (by population) from the eight local government areas in the region. As a final fallback, Australia Post databases provide for a record of reliably large scale from which to draw a random sample.

Recipients of the invitation will be invited to register electronically with nDF to indicate that they are available for the final selection. Based on those available, a further stratified random draw is then conducted which seeks to randomly match to the stratification detail set out above.

The response list is then checked against the original invitation list. NDF has previously used unique security codes on each invitation to prevent the invitations being passed on (defeating the random element), but in practice the simple measure of automatically ensuring addresses registered match to one where we sent an invitation has proven sufficient – it is very easy to call to confirm a registration and ask where they received it if we can see we didn't post one. (We make these calls as occasionally a business owner will receive one at a work address and register from a home address.)

Just as in juries payment of per diems is strongly advised so as to avoid excluding participants who may find this a hardship.

### Selection of Participants

Invitations for the CP would be issued to *around* 7,000 addresses, ideally being complemented by an additional random draw from youth populations (TAFE or training colleges) to maximise the response rate in the 18-24 category which is highly challenging to secure.

Invitations will clearly note that a payment will be made for time, and that accommodation/ meal costs are being met for the weekend sessions.

Invitations should come from Minister Hunter on behalf of the Parliament, while using the newDemocracy name to note the independence of a selection process which is outside the control of government. They will explain the process and ask the recipient to decide to confirm availability for selection in the CP. (*5% response rate required*)

From the positive responses, a sample is drawn electronically based on the pre-agreed stratification goals referred to above. The aim is to achieve a group descriptively representative of the community even if one subset of the community responds disproportionately to the initial invitation. The key measure of success is partly subjective: do parliamentarians, the local community and the media see a group that looks like who they see in their daily lives?

The sample drawn is contacted by email seeking a confirmation in writing from the participant, and NDF also contacts each participant 2-3 times by phone prior to the first meeting to build a personal commitment to participating: once underway we can't backfill for non-attendees so those selected need to feel sufficiently engaged to attend on the first day regardless of other circumstances.

The sample (which incorporates 2-3 reserves to allow for occasional dropouts in the day or two prior to the first meeting) will be provided a comprehensive schedule, code of conduct and explanatory kit of pre-reading (generally an online private forum using WordPress with a library of documents and submissions), with a request of the recipient to provide a final acceptance allowing NDF to finalise the panel.

The group is convened solely for this process: any future deliberative process requires recommencing a fresh selection process.

### Preparation and Information Process

Information and judgement are required in equal parts to reach decisions. newDemocracy advocates these processes because the judgement of random samples (or mini-publics) has been shown to achieve very high levels of public trust because they are non-partisan. It is thus imperative that the method of provision of information to the policy jury does not erode that trust.

The technical depth of the question necessitates a comprehensive briefing book being prepared by DEWNR. It is understood that there is no such thing as “perfectly impartial”: the facilitator will explain to the participants that *all* sources have a point of view and that some bias is inevitable. Deliberation gives them the time to identify this and provide balance. It is the panel’s own diversity that is the most effective counterbalance to bias (real and perceived).

It is essential that DEWNR directs the agency’s internal staff to urgently meet all requests for information from the jury: effectively “opening the books” without nuance or filter, and to make available staff to present this information.

Information selection can be a very time consuming process. A portion of this work comes from the self-interested willingness of advocacy groups and interested third parties to engage via submissions of their own independent work (referred to previously). A wider public call for submissions is also factored into the design, and the operation of the jury allows it to ask to hear more from the author of any submission.

NDF is open to the use of any online environments preferred by Government to solicit contributions or for dissemination of materials used by the jury in their deliberations.

### What Does the Community Panel Decide?

It is of central importance that the limit of the group’s decision-making authority is pre-agreed and clearly conveyed. This must be expressed simply, broadly and openly so as not to be interpreted as directing a particular decision.

It is proposed that the remit of the panel is to reach agreement on a recommended approach to the following:

**How should we pay for maintaining our largest local infrastructure asset - the South East Drainage Network?**

The State Government will commit \$2.2m p.a.

Do we want to spend more than that, and if so, how do we fairly share this cost across the region?

In terms of authority, it is proposed that:

- **The Minister commits to meet with the Community Panel at the commencement of the Panel's deliberations.**
- **The Minister commits to meet with the Community Panel to discuss the final recommendations of the Community Panel.**
- **The Minister commits to submit to Cabinet the outcomes of the Community Panel's Deliberations**
- **The Minister commits to table the recommendations in Parliament**
- **The Minister commits to respond publically to the recommendations**

In short, this needs to pass the test of being the single best offer to participate in a shared public decision that a citizen can ever expect to receive - and this is central to the very high positive response rates we are able to achieve for jury invitations of this type.

#### What Constitutes a Decision?

In order to shift the public mindset from adversarial, two-party, either/or contests and convey a message of broad-based support for the recommendations, NDF recommends an 80% supermajority be required for a final decision from the jury. In practice, citizens' panels tend to reach consensus (or group consent) positions with minority voices included in any report; they rarely need to go to a vote. Decisions are frequently unanimous. NDF will document for the panellists.

#### Operations

A skilled facilitator will be required for the process and should ideally be recognised by the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2).

The newDemocracy Foundation will operate the jury selection process to ensure there is the highest public confidence in the rigour and independence of the randomisation of invitations (and by extension as to why a given individual was not selected). As we have experienced in other processes, the public will accept our 'rejection' far more easily than if this is required to come from government, as principal.

Meetings will be spread across the extensive geographic region to permit the participants to visit as much of the infrastructure as possible. For this reason (and the related travel requirement) the jury



will meet three times for weekend sessions with an overnight Saturday stay provided where required. Venues should be identified as a matter of priority.

The newDemocracy Foundation uses an integrated print and distribution service capable of very fast turnaround production for invitations while ensuring no data is actually provided to the Foundation.

### Media Role

The role of the media in supplying information about the exercise is crucial. We have noted in other processes that the community should have the chance to see and identify with the people involved: an evoked response of “*people like me made the decision*” will see the recommendation earn widespread trust.

It is important that the Minister endorse the process *at the outset before any results are known*.

Given the degree of controversy attached to the issue, it is proposed to conduct a long format media briefing prior to the commencement of the process so local media can have a chance to interrogate the methodology and assure themselves that there is no possibility of a pre-ordained outcome being “laundered” through an engagement process. The central reason to conduct the process is to earn public trust: for this to be achieved all elements of operations should be shared at the earliest possible time. The briefing invitation should come from DEWNR given their local knowledge and existing relationships with regional media outlets, but indicate that what is being offered is a private (or group, if the media prefer) session where no questions are off limits. This should be timed to come at the same time as the call for submissions, so that articles land with an explanation of the process and the note that submissions from interested parties can be made from now until January (via email, or post to NDF).

Beyond this point, it is imperative we introduce the jury who will be deliberating as early as possible in the process (ideally just after the first weekend) and well before any direction (of their recommendations) is known. If the community trust the participants, they will trust the recommendations. For this to occur you cannot be seeing the participants for the first time when you read of their recommendations or the benefit is largely lost.

### Costing Outline

Key cost areas are outlined below. (Items a, d, f, g & h are already under contract between DEWNR and NDF)

- a. Printing and postage (7,000 invitations to print plus \$0.62 per piece to post) estimated at \$7,700.
- b. Catering of \$10,080 (6 days x 24pax @ \$70ph day average).
- c. Hotel (3 nights x 24pax x \$140 per night) estimated at \$10,800
- d. Travel expenses/ participant per diems (~24 x \$400 pp) of \$9,600

e. Independent facilitators for a total cost of ~\$40,000.

f. Provision should be made within the budget for a reasonable level of expenses (travel and accommodation) and executive time for nDF representatives: estimated at \$2,000.

Items a-f amount to **\$80,180**.

Process design and selection administration will be provided by the Foundation on the cost recovery basis included in point 'h' below.

As a research institute the Foundation requests:

g. that DEWNR funds a research project which will capture what is learned through the innovation process up to the value of \$12,000. As part of our ATO compliance, the topic of research will be set by the Research Committee of The newDemocracy Foundation.

h. that a services grant of \$22,000 is made to the newDemocracy Fund which contributes to the operation of the Foundation and to the future of improving democracy in Australia.

These research items amount to an additional **\$34,000**. The total project cost is thus **\$114,180**.

The SE NRM Board is funding the implementation of the Community Panel from an allocation of the regional NRM Levy for 2014/2015 as an important and foundational piece of work to complement the preparation of the South East Drainage and Wetland Strategy. The development of the Strategy has been identified as a key planning priority of the SE NRM Board and the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board to guide the future management of water in the drainage system.

*(\*Paragraph above provided by DEWNR)*

Key Issues to be managed:

- Minister's agreement as to remit and authority.
- Interface with internal subject matter experts (agency internal) and stakeholder contributors to ensure accessibility and availability for participation.
- Interest group buy-in and focus on breadth of submissions, and communication of the opportunity to make a submission. Early scheduling of NDF briefing session (likely two – Naracoorte and Mt Gambier) strongly advised.
- Allocation of responsibilities for communications task (this is also an education campaign for the broader community for a new concept, and needs to be approached as such).
- Early securing of venues and accommodation.
- Recruitment of facilitator, and facilitator's review and contribution to this process design.
- Tour itinerary(s) for subject matter familiarity.

- Use of photography/ video to complement information package given large geographic spread of infrastructure.

DRAFT TIMELINE FOR 2014/15 DELIBERATIVE PROCESS:

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, WATER & NATURAL RESOURCES

**WHO PAYS? AGREEING FAIR SHARES IN INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING**

IDENTIFYING THE VIEW OF AN INFORMED PUBLIC

**Topic: How should we pay for maintaining our largest local infrastructure asset - the South East Drainage Network?**

*The State Government will commit \$2.2m p.a.*

*Do we want to spend more than that, and if so, how do we fairly share this cost across the region?*

***The jury is asked for specific, measurable and actionable recommendations.***

<p>September 9<sup>th</sup> "Kickoff"  (via teleconference)</p>	<p>DEWNR Govt and nDF preparatory planning session. Key topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Identify required background materials and expert/ contributor program for inclusion. Agree document co-ordinator.</li> <li>➤ List communication targets for submissions and contributions (interest group involvement). Include media.</li> <li>➤ Revise/ amend/ review program dates and goals.</li> <li>➤ Agree media and communications protocols – how we work together. Include Ministerial liaison.</li> <li>➤ Final budget approval by each party.</li> <li>➤ Finalise date specifics – check for major event clashes.</li> <li>➤ Finalise venue bookings.</li> <li>➤ Dataset confirmed and supplied (early Oct OK).</li> <li>➤ Confirm timing of Media briefing</li> </ul>
<p>Early October</p>	<p><u>Deadline</u> for recruitment and briefing of independent, skilled lead facilitator – <b>Oct 1<sup>st</sup></b> (this document and 3-way briefing call or in-person mtg)</p> <p>Selection of online platform services if required (preferred).</p> <p>Media briefing, call for submissions and stakeholder briefings commence <b>by early October and run until early November</b>. (Submissions accepted until mid January)</p> <p>Printed invitation approved and ready to post <b>October 24<sup>th</sup></b></p> <p>In post to a random sample of 7,000 citizens, plus possible additional ~1000 from a student data set. <b>Wednesday November 5<sup>th</sup></b> Agree <i>RSVP deadline + 3 weeks</i>. (confirm <b>Tuesday November 25<sup>th</sup></b>)</p> <p>(Sample extract provided as .xls from data provider with separate fields for</p>

	street, suburb, postcode)
December	<p>First round selection to secure representatives. (<u>Complete</u> by <b>Wednesday December 10th</b>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Seeking approx. 24-26 citizens (allows for reserves).</li> <li>➤ Explanation of commitment required: attendance at all elements of process, including potential online discussion presence.</li> <li>➤ Stratified random sample to deliver descriptive match to community (NDF to provide technology/ expertise and to call each selected participant).</li> </ul> <p><i>N.B. List of attendees will not be provided to DEWNR.</i></p>
Late January	Finalisation of Panels. Provision of welcome kit of materials (via email, limited distribution by hard copy in post). Live online discussion environment for participants with a focus on introductions, socialisation and pre-reading.
<p>Day 1</p> <p><b><u>Saturday Jan 31<sup>st</sup></u></b></p> <p><i>Naracoorte</i></p>	<p><b>Opening weekend – Meeting, Immersion, Familiarisation &amp; Norms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Introduction of the topic upon which they will deliberate: understanding remit and authority. Explanation of influence and context: what will be done with the results the Jury produces.</li> <li>➤ Introduction of the process, and its precedents; understanding the inevitability of bias &amp; importance of constructive, critical thinking/doing.</li> <li>➤ Agreement on Jury guidelines for participation.</li> <li>➤ Day tour for subject matter immersion.</li> <li>➤ Initial immersion into understanding extent, scale and scope of benefits from drainage system. (the <i>'history lesson'</i>). Include agricultural and environmental perspectives as baseline.</li> </ul> <p>Welcome from Minister strongly recommended if possible. (one hour)</p>
<p>Day 2</p> <p>Sunday Feb 1<sup>st</sup></p>	<p><b>The First Deliberation– The Learning Phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Panel sessions with 5-7 expert speakers (decided by previous stakeholder sessions) to open the day. <i>*location dependent</i></li> <li>➤ Key content from DEWNR: understanding the costs of the system (as known to the Department)</li> <li>➤ Group to identify speakers sought for future assemblies: start to explore <i>"What do we need to know and who do we trust to inform us?"</i></li> </ul>
<p>Day 3</p> <p><b><u>Saturday Feb 21<sup>st</sup></u></b></p> <p><i>Mt Gambier</i></p>	<p><b>Second Weekend – Acquiring a Deeper Understanding</b></p> <p>Panel will still be exploring content from background materials and 'learning what they don't know' to generate further requests for information and expertise.</p> <p>Subject to scheduling a speed dialogue session with NRM Board and SE Drainage Board should be included at this meeting.</p>

	<p>Further panel session of experts should be held: stakeholders are requested to keep time free. Provisional times should be left for international experts to be linked via Skype.</p>
<p>Day 4</p> <p>Sunday Feb 22<sup>nd</sup></p>	<p><b>Exploring Tradeoffs and Focussing on Hard Issues</b></p> <p>The Panel will be asked to begin thinking about a structure for what they want to say to Government. No templates or pre-written content is provided – it is important they start from a blank sheet of paper rather than endorsing a Draft document produced by Government.</p> <p>Further speakers, and potentially an additional technical session are still likely at this meeting. A further ‘key stakeholder’ panel discussion may be scheduled to maximise knowledge/ perspective sharing opportunity.</p> <p>It is <u>essential</u> that one page of top line key messages to government – the executive summary of what the panel wishes to convey to the Minister – is agreed in written form by the conclusion of the day.</p>
<p>Tuesday Feb 24<sup>th</sup></p>	<p><i>Convenors’ Review: do the participants need more time or assistance to come to a full understanding of their choices? Potential to extend meeting schedule (extending to an evening session on the final Saturday) at this point to ensure participants are not rushed to artificial consensus. Jury should not be made aware additional time is held for them. (Ensure hotel meeting rooms are held for this purpose)</i></p>
<p>Day 5</p> <p><b>Saturday March 14<sup>th</sup></b></p> <p><i>Keith</i></p>	<p><b>The Third Weekend – Reflect. Discuss. Deliberate.</b></p> <p>The goal is to provide a face-to-face forum to find where consensus exists, and what are the “must have” items in their report.</p> <p>The need to accommodate local stakeholders should be accommodated early (first thing) on the Saturday as otherwise the panellists will be quite advanced in formulating recommendations. The ability to involve stakeholders at this late stage will allow panellists to sanity check their thinking about possible solutions.</p> <p>The facilitator should encourage groups to move toward commencing the prioritisation task and end the day with a “long list” of priorities (and possible funding structures if new expenditure is required). A rough draft (estimated as likely 5-7 pages) <b>must</b> be completed by end of day or the group will not finish.</p> <p>This draft report has form but will still have “rough edges”. An Executive Summary of 5-7 top priorities should be agreed but specific action items within those areas may still be amended.</p> <p>An expert roundtable session (rotating among the jurors in small table groups) may be utilised to ‘sanity test’ recommendations prior to report completion. This will be offered to the group on <b>Sunday March 1<sup>st</sup></b>.</p>

<p>Day 6</p> <p>Sunday March 15<sup>th</sup></p>	<p><b>Owning the Shared Solution</b></p> <p>The focus of the final day is a consensus session which may incorporate new information to reinforce or support the recommendations. A read-through session to finalise the draft report. Target completion by lunchtime, and keep afternoon as spare time</p> <p>Recommendation(s) must be Specific, Measurable, Actionable, Realistic and with a Time horizon.</p> <p>Formal handover to SE Regional NRM Board representative at end of day who will convey this to Minister. Thank you and farewell function to be held late afternoon.</p>
<p>End March</p> <p>(approx Sat 28<sup>th</sup> March – 1 hour)</p> <p><i>Millicent</i></p>	<p><b>Shared Decisions – Discourse with the Minister</b></p> <p>The Minister has a discussion with the Panel having had a chance to review the report.</p>
<p>Monday March 30<sup>th</sup></p>	<p>Process debrief and agreement on Action Items (NDF and DEWNR).</p>