

PROCESS DESIGN FOR NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE PROJECT

COMPONENT 1: THE AGENDA JURY

SETTING THE AGENDA: WHAT DO WE REALLY NEED TO TALK ABOUT?

Overview

The newDemocracy Foundation has completed a Nuclear Fuel Cycle Engagement Strategy for the Department of Premier and Cabinet. The central goal of this document was to outline a program to engage a vast, diverse swathe of the South Australian people in a discussion based on the facts contained in the Royal Commission report. That strategy called for an initial agenda-setting jury to assist the wider population in understanding the critical elements. This document details the key elements in delivering this component of the process.

Most public debates are dominated from the outset by those with the most acute interest: a logical, reasonable and predictable outcome. However, for a decision with a wide range of potential concerns and conditionalities within various communities a counterbalancing non-advocate voice needs to be sourced and given priority.

This concept is based on the successful Citizens Initiative Review which is part of the Oregon (US) referendum model. Having initially been the subject of a two year trial, it received bi-partisan legislative support as 'how we should do government'. The reason for this was that the state was becoming beholden to and hamstrung by a clamoured-for direct democratic model of Citizens Initiated Referenda. A referendum is a blunt tool capturing a vox-pop sentiment and proves highly susceptible to being won by the largest spending entity with a simplistic slogan. It could be easily argued that these were 'citizen initiated' in name only, with millions of dollars being required to campaign for the hundreds of thousands of signatures required and millions more to secure the vote through 30 second commercials. It is a fundamentally poor way to assess and elicit an informed public view.

The Oregon Citizens Initiated Review methodology affords 24 randomly selected citizens the chance to produce a voting guide for a given referenda topic. After a period of numerous days of in-person deliberation a concise 1-2 page summary is produced by citizens noting that (for example) 18 of 24 citizens initially held a given view but were influenced by a source highlighting Fact X. This lets voters get beyond slogans and gives them a helpful kickstart to more fully informing themselves. Critically, while the voting population did not always follow the jury's view, the direct nexus between advertising spending and referendum success was broken. The State has since seen a decline in the number of referendum topics being proposed, with a common view being held that certain advocates no longer believe they can withstand the scrutiny of a random pool of voters given the time to look at the topic in detail.

The parallel is a good one: there will be passionate advocates on either side of this topic. This is a balancing exercise to assist the 1,039,000 voters in South Australia make an important decision with

a guide produced by everyday people like themselves rather than a government entity with an implied or widely assumed point of view.

If a jury can deliver around three pages of guidance about what they found the most interesting, surprising or contentious about the Royal Commission Report this will help citizens make a considered decision.

Background and Context

This is a companion piece to a publicly available report which outlines the overarching Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission Engagement Strategy. The two documents should be read together to understand the overall context of other engagement activities which are dependent on the results of this process.

Project Objective

For the first time, the key audience for a Citizens' Jury report will be an entire population rather than a Minister or a small group of elected representatives. More than ever, the rationale for pursuing this approach is to create trust. A jury can be relied upon to call out that which they doubt and that which they endorse without impairments on their judgment as they don't have to worry about outside influencers in the same way professional advocates and elected representatives are seen to need to.

A successful project will result in what amounts to a *'Where to start'* style companion guide which assists everyday citizens to understand the Royal Commission Report.

It will aim for consensus where possible but will allow for minority views to be aired: the key elements are to allow time for reflection and discussion before reaching conclusions, and to fairly reflect the room. If 4 of 50 people believe x is important, then the low number of people noting that is informative to the wider population.

As ever, this is not an exercise in turning citizens into experts. The overall engagement question is itself a general one (*'Should South Australia continue to pursue opportunities connected to the Nuclear Fuel Cycle?'*). Success will see a report grounded in references to factual evidence (pro and con) rather than unlinked emotive statements.

A key companion objective (and first key hurdle) is one of transparency and trust in the people convened: the vast majority of South Australians must see and have proven to them that the recruitment process was genuinely random and not gamed. Citizen trust in government does not enjoy a high baseline, and one would not expect that activity in this topic to be more trusted than the average.

Our 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 single politician, an

interest group or financial interest. Equally, those active interests must be engaged sufficiently early and substantively as to see the process as worthy of an investment of their time.

NDF's self interest in this process is to demonstrate the desirability of a structural role for randomly selected everyday citizens in helping elected representatives take decisions which earn widespread public trust. We hold the view that a project as visible as this is central to a transformative evolution of how we 'do' democracy.

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 wider community is told that a random mix of 40-50 of their fellow citizens had read a detailed Royal Commission Report and produced a summary for them to consider, then they immediately have a greater chance of being trusted that someone in elected office, a public service role, an advocacy role or an appointed capacity delivering that message.

If we can successfully convey to the wider community that citizens like them are being given *complete* access to the Government's and Royal Commission's information assets, are studying detailed information and hearing from subject-matter experts of their own choosing, then the community's faith should increase still further.

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 Theorum).

Equally, we respect the need of industry and advocacy groups to hold the view *‘if you haven’t heard from person X then how can you possibly be well informed’*. For this reason, we strongly recommend directly involving the same array of expert speakers the Royal Commission relied upon to present the introduction to the topic. But we will also allow citizens to reach beyond this group to their own self-identified trusted sources.

NDF make a conscious decision to pursue a format skewed to in-person meetings and larger number of participants. We value the importance of achieving *‘people like me’* descriptive (visual) representativeness while ensuring that sufficient time is spent on the issue and exploring it in enough depth to own the final group decision – a disaster is people ‘just raising their hand’ to get it over with. Our goal (one achieved in every past project) is that the participants feel so invested in their recommendations that they will take the hard step of standing in front of their report rather than just leaving it to government.

Core Methodology

In nDF’s most used approach, a range of engagement activities (surveys, submissions, vox pop social media techniques etc) are funnelled into a jury’s deliberations. That is not the case here, because the task of the jury is not to reach a recommendation in the policy area, but rather one of agenda setting and making sense of a Royal Commission Report.

Understanding and critiquing a Royal Commission report is usually done by people employed in the field – the average everyday citizen will never have read one. As a result, its assessment is normally done by people with a pre-committed point of view. Proponents will identify facts in their favour, while opponents will argue for the primacy of a different set of facts within the report that support their view. Each approach is sensible, but makes it difficult for the wider community to get beyond their own pre-ordained view as we gravitate to sources which we agree with. A jury can get beyond these preconceptions as they are “people like me” so warrant listening to.

As a result, the jury methodology here revolves completely around the Royal Commission Report, and the opening two meetings should immerse the participants as much as possible with the sources the Royal Commission relied upon in order that the citizens can form their own judgment on the primary sources. Significant information sessions (around 90 minutes each) will be required with two types of source:

- Firstly, those within the Royal Commission; then
- A subset of those who made a submission to the Royal Commission, spanning the broadest possible range of views (the goal being for others with an active view to see their voice being heard)

As a result of this first weekend, jurors will have clarifying questions and potentially want additional information to help round out what they choose to share in their summary report. Scope is allowed for them to request additional information and insight from any source – noting that there is a significant baseline in the 170+ people and organisations who made a submission to the Royal Commission. Control over sources is central to trust. This will occupy much of the third day, with key topline themes emerging by the end of the day.

The final day is devoted to producing a document which fairly reflects the position of the jury to assist everyday people find the most important things to weigh up in the Royal Commission Report.

Alignment and Integration Key Dates for DPC

<p>Phase 1</p> <p><i>Week 1-2 May 2016</i></p>	<p>Agree plan, timings and budget.</p> <p>Procurement of facilitator.</p> <p>NDF communicate to community stakeholders who we are and role/ value of jury (as per NFC Engagement Strategy).</p> <p>Stakeholders understand and value opportunity for involvement primarily at subsequent process stages (mass engagement/ kitchen table discussions) as all will have made submissions through the Royal Commission period.</p> <p>Jury recruitment active (end May) and pre-reading period started (early June).</p>
<p>Phase 2</p> <p><i>June to early July</i></p> <p><i>(** Note complexity with Federal election July 2nd)</i></p>	<p>Jury meeting and deliberation period.</p> <p>The Tentative Findings of the Royal Commission are comparatively brief, allowing our jury to read them prior to the first meeting – although it is anticipated the final report will be longer and more detailed. The submissions are harder to navigate and a companion summary guide will be of value if this can be provided.</p> <p>‘Shared ownership’ is a core idea – the jury must <u>own</u> what they produce.</p> <p>Report will become public but with no expectation of response (as we are asking the Government to refrain from any advocacy position either positive or negative).</p>
<p>Phase 3</p> <p><i>July-September</i></p>	<p>Mass distribution of first Citizens’ Jury Report as starting point summary guide to the full Royal Commission Report.</p> <p>Recommendation is to conclude post-Federal election as there</p>

	will be limited community focus prior to this.
Phase 4 <i>October</i>	<p>The 50 members of this jury are part of the 350 member Decision Jury which assesses the community feedback and weighs up whether or not community consent exists to continue to pursue opportunities connected with the nuclear fuel cycle.</p> <p>It is important to note at the outset that jurors will be involved in this decision to avoid their rushing to stronger recommendations in the initial process.</p>

Selection

We will operate a jury of approximately 50 citizens meeting for two full weekends for 4 days of meetings.

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. The more citizens can identify with an individual participant and see ‘people like me’ making a decision rather than government “telling them what to do” the greater the chance of success both in enabling a decision and in having the wider community amenable to its content.

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>)

In order to achieve a descriptively representative sample, nDF has considered a range of stratification options. Our recommendation is to proceed with only basic variables (age, gender, metro/ regional location) and leave it to the statistical benefit of randomisation and probability to deliver people across a range of professions, lifestyles, ethnic and cultural backgrounds etc. The household type variable (owner occupier or tenant) is used as an effective surrogate indicator of income and education which may otherwise prove unlikely to be accurately disclosed – and we are particularly mindful of the need to have the broadest possible range of educational backgrounds in the room. Finally, we will stratify by aggregated postcodes to ensure that approximately 20% of participants come from outside the Adelaide metropolitan area.

We do not plan to ask respondents to self-identify as being indigenous and stratify a matching proportion of participants in the room. Two points should be noted in this decision. Firstly, nDF has enjoyed participation from indigenous members of the community without using this variable which is most likely due to the fact that most people (regardless of cultural background) want to be part of decisions which affect them. Secondly, as a self-identified variable there is no checking mechanism we are able to apply and this has been a question not always answered honestly.

Selection – Operational Detail

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 a more representative sample than any other community process.

In a comparatively small jury 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.

We will post invitations to a random sample of 25,000 physical addresses (not billing addresses) drawn from the electoral roll, land titles information or an Australia Post database. We need to ensure that tenants are reached – in short, the widest possible catchment. To complement this, we will flood the sample with additional databases reaching low-response groups (primarily 18-24s, but also regional addresses which can suffer from slow postal service). This simply ensures sufficient quantities of RSVPs are received to conduct the second round random draw.

Recipients of the invitation will be invited to register electronically with nDF to indicate that they are available for the final selection (a phone option is also offered). Based on those available, a second round 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.)

NDF will not provide any juror information to DPC (personal or contact details). Public cynicism around potential “vetting” is sufficiently high that our goal of public trust is threatened by any perception that lists are reviewed. DPC will meet the participants for the first time on the first day of the jury.

Just as in juries payment of per diems is **strongly** advised so as to avoid excluding participants who may find this a hardship: this is proposed as around \$500 per participant in total. This is a fairness payment which is below ABS information (November 2015, report 6302.0) reporting ‘*All employees average weekly total earnings*’ at \$1145.60 which equates to approximately \$230 per day.

Invitations will clearly note that this payment will be made for time, and that meals are provided. Accommodation and travel expenses will be provided for regional participants living more than 70 minutes from the CBD venue.

Invitations should come from the Premier to emphasise to potential participants the likely importance and impact of their involvement in the task. We emphasise 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.

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 government, elected representatives, the wider 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 twice 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.

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 this jury does not erode that trust.

There is no such thing as “perfectly impartial” information: **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 jury's own diversity that is the most effective counterbalance to bias (real and perceived).

There are four key sources of information to inform the deliberations:

1. The Royal Commission Report;
2. The expert contributors to the Royal Commission, and the Royal Commission staff;
3. Submissions from active stakeholders to the Royal Commission; and
4. Any sources directly requested by the Citizens' Jury, without limitation by government.

What Does the Agenda Jury 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 will serve to focus their discussions.

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

What are the parts of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission report that everyone needs to discuss?

In terms of authority, it is proposed that:

You are the independent producers of an independent guide to help every South Australian understand the tradeoffs raised by the Royal Commission.

Your unedited and unchanged report will be distributed with every copy of the Royal Commission report.

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?

We will work with the facilitators to encourage the jury to find common ground where possible: finding statements with broad agreement is of the highest value. However, the core task is to fairly reflect the view of the room, and in this circumstance that is likely to include dissenting views.

As a fictional example:

Recommendation: we agree a key point to consider is that it is healthy to go outside in the sun (paragraph XYZ of Royal Commission).

Minority view: 7 of 50 people were of the view we should not go out in the middle of the day but other times were fine.

The addition of the minority view serves to create a statement that more of the room can agree accurately reflects the discussion.

Core Operations

Highly skilled facilitators, experienced with deliberative methods, will be required.

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.

NDF maintains ongoing oversight with a specific focus on speaker recruitment. A dedicated project management liaison within DPC is essential.

Media Role

The role of the media in supplying information about the exercise is crucial – these processes work better in garnering public trust with a high degree of scrutiny from the outset.

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 critically important that the Premier visibly endorse the process *at the outset before any results are known*. Prior projects demonstrate that those willing to take the risk at the outset of very publicly agreeing to listen to any result earn greater scope for action when the recommendations are presented.

Costing Estimate/ Outline

[This section should be redacted for the facilitator RFQ process and reinstated at the conclusion of procurement as part of NDF's full disclosure of project design and methodology]

Key cost areas within the direct NDF scope of responsibilities are outlined below. Where these costs are incurred by NDF we only seek actual cost recovery and original invoicing will be supplied. Our preference is for costs to be handled directly by DPC wherever possible.

- a. Printing and postage estimated at \$41,000 (25,000 pieces).
- b. Database access costs ~\$2000 (land titles or electoral roll free, but allow admin costs for others).
- c. Participant per diems (50 x \$500 pp) of \$25,000
- d. Facilitator (2x, plus planning and preparation days) of \$48,000
- e. Catering (50 x 4 days x \$50pppd) of \$10,000
- f. Travel/ accomm for regional jurors (est. 10 x 2 x \$700) of \$14,000
- g. Provision should be made within the budget for a reasonable level of expenses for nDF representatives (air, accomm, transfers): estimated at \$3,000.

h. Costs for stakeholder briefings are embedded in items (d) and (g)

i. Venues (with AV capability) are assumed to be available in government buildings.

Items a-i amount to **\$143,000**. All figures ex GST.

This process design is provided pro bono (as a supplement to the overall NFC Engagement Strategy), while jury selection administration is being provided by the Foundation on a basic cost recovery basis subject to a separate procurement agreement.

As a research institute the Foundation requests:

j. that DPC contributes to a research fund which will capture what is learned through the innovation process up to the value of **\$15,000**. As part of our ATO compliance, the topic of research will be set by the Research Committee of The newDemocracy Foundation.

k. that a services grant for advisory and oversight through the project of **\$25,000** 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 **\$40,000**. The total estimated project cost is thus **\$183,000**.

Key Issues to be managed:

- DPC reach agreement as to process – most specifically and explicitly the remit and authority, as once announced this cannot be changed.
- Once agreed, production of invitation and commencement of short timeframe recruitment task.
- Urgent recruitment of highly experienced facilitator.
- Allocation of responsibilities for communications task (as part of an education campaign for the broader community spanning the entire engagement project).
- Early securing of venues.
- Facilitator's review and contribution to this process design at an early stage.

TIMELINE FOR 2016 AGENDA JURY:

DEPARTMENT OF PREMIER & CABINET

PROJECT: SETTING THE AGENDA

What are the parts of the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission report that everyone needs to discuss?

You are the independent producers of an independent guide to help every South Australian understand the tradeoffs raised by the Royal Commission.

Your unedited and unchanged report will be distributed with every copy of the Royal Commission report.

The Jury is in essence preparing a 'How to navigate' card.

<p>Kickoff Pre-May 9th</p>	<p>DPC, nDF and partners preparatory planning session. Key topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identify required background materials and expert/ contributor program for inclusion. Agree document co-ordinator and delivery date (specifically with relation to RC submissions). ➤ Confirm availability for 14 key expert speakers who informed the Royal Commission. ➤ List stakeholder communication targets (may be addressed by overall NFC Engagement Process briefing). ➤ Identify critical media partners and seek early briefing – specifically with regard to recruitment opportunity. ➤ Finalise program dates and goals. ➤ Final budget approval by all parties. ➤ Finalise date specifics – check for major event clashes. ➤ Finalise venue bookings. ➤ Dataset(s) confirmed and supplied.
<p>Week 2 May</p>	<p><i>Deadline for recruitment and briefing of independent, skilled lead facilitator – April 8th (this document and 3-way briefing call or in-person mtg)</i></p>
<p>May</p>	<p><i>Media briefing, and invitations to stakeholder briefings (May 9/10).</i></p> <p><i>Stakeholder briefing</i></p> <p><i>Printed invitations designed and approved Monday May 2nd</i></p> <p><i>Printed invitation posted Monday May 9th</i></p> <p><i>RSVP final close Friday May 27th</i></p>
<p>June</p>	<p>First round selection to secure jury representatives. (<u>Complete by Friday June 3rd</u>)</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Seeking approx. 53 citizens (50 plus reserves). ➤ Email explanation of commitment required: attendance at all elements of process, active reading of Royal Commission report. ➤ Stratified random sample to deliver descriptive match to community (NDF to provide technology/ expertise and to call each selected participant). <p><i>N.B. List of attendees will <u>not</u> be provided to DPC as part of neutrality promise. Cynics will suggest these people are handpicked favorites of government: the best counter argument is to encourage an FOI request which returns zero contact with this jury.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Supply NFC Royal Commission Report (online and hard copy) June 10th. Express Post to maximise reading time.
Thursday June 9 th	Finalisation of Jury.
Day 1 Saturday June 25th (Full day required)	<p>Opening day: The First Deliberation – Learn through Immersion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Understanding the task is critical: its <u>not</u> about resolving the final question, its about helping others to find the key information for discussion. ➤ Explanation of influence and context: what will be done with the results the Jury produces. ➤ Introduction of the process, and its precedents; understanding the inevitability of bias & importance of constructive, critical thinking/doing. ➤ Agreement on Jury guidelines for participation. ➤ Key content: walk through of Royal Commission Report and at least one expert group panel and discussion session. ➤ Key deliverable: start the “callout process” of key points and any questions on group reporting. Have the jury writing their own content to expedite final report writing. <p>Welcome from Premier and (former) Royal Commissioner strongly recommended if possible.</p>
Day 2 Sunday June 26th <i>Suggest soft 2:00pm finish to (a) give people back part of weekend and (b) reflect likely fatigue factor at end of two intense days.</i>	<p>The Second Deliberation – Understanding and Immersion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Jury will still be exploring content from background materials and ‘learning what they don’t know’ to generate further requests for information and expertise. ➤ Further Royal Commission speakers will present: “broadening speakers” with greatest possible diversity of views. ➤ Emphasise jury ownership over their time. They may seek assistance (other experts or speakers, including from submissions) or a deep dive into specific content. This may be in plenary or they can break into groups. <p>Purpose of meeting is to continue broadening of the topic rather than a rush</p>

	to solutions, although we continue to capture key points of importance as this will prove to be of assistance in the final writing phase.
<p>Day 3</p> <p><u>Saturday July 9th</u></p> <p>(Full day)</p> <p><i>** Note: date gap has been set to reflect Federal election and allow time for reflection.</i></p> <p><i>Low value in releasing report prior to July 2nd so 'delay' is minor.**</i></p>	<p>The Third Deliberation – Focus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Use prompts to explain task: Oregon Citizens Initiative Review are a good 'real world' prompt while in no way leading as to content. Rough 'conceptual' outline of companion document with no real content may be of value. ➤ Potential for early clustering of major ideas and any clear "in/out" decisions commences. No pre-written content is provided – it is important they start from a blank sheet of paper rather than endorsing a Draft document in any form. ➤ Allowance of content/speaker time in specific topic areas at jury's discretion. ➤ Day should conclude with a rough outline of written content: format and 5-6 key ideas give them a framework to build from. (Group may nominate subset of members to finesse wording overnight.) <p>Three key checkpoint questions of value can be put to assess progress:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>How does our understanding of this issue help the community answer the question?</i> 2. <i>Why is it critical to the success of setting our priorities?</i> 3. <i>What else do we need to understand about this issue to best advise the wider community?</i>
Close of Saturday	<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 at this point while still meeting final date requirement.</i>
<p>Day 4</p> <p><u>Sunday July 10th</u></p>	<p>The Fourth Deliberation – Shared Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Given the <i>comparatively</i> constrained task and existence of working notes, the need for distributing the writing task is likely relatively limited before resuming the group in a single plenary session. ➤ Stress testing can occur. NDF can play devil's advocate to note where recommendations are open to subjective interpretation or are in cross-conflict. This does not (must not) redirect the jury's intent, but is simply an exercise in critical thinking. <p>The Final Decision <u>Must</u> ask the group - <i>Can we live with it?</i> – to secure explicit buy-in. <i>Will we stand shoulder to shoulder in the media to explain our decision?</i></p> <p>Handover to Premier.</p>

	Note to Jury that they will return to be part of the final Decision Jury.
--	---