

Recap Meet-Up #7 – Thursday 18 October 2018



Meet Up Agenda

1. Welcome and introduction of the topic – Deliberative Design: A rear window view from the ACT
2. Brief overview of four recent deliberative processes in the ACT
3. Group breakout discussions
4. Wrap-up
5. Next meeting, 22 November at 5.30pm

Welcome

The facilitators, Ms Beth Slatyer and Ms Karen Stewart-Moore, welcomed the group of around 25 participants. Dr Simon Niemeyer was an apology as the facilitator due to illness.

The facilitators outlined that Meet Up #7 would focus on the design elements of each of the processes and the reasoning behind the designs. Meet Up #8 is an opportunity to consider the implementation of processes through the lens of the Principles/Criteria for the Trial of Citizens' Juries in the ACT – Jointly prepared by the Canberra Alliance for Participatory Democracy (CAPaD) and the ACT Council of Social Service Inc (ACTCOSS).

We thank the Museum of Australian Democracy for the tour of *Democracy: Are you In?* for DeliberateACT members and for its continued hosting of our meetings.

Brief overview of four recent deliberative processes in the ACT

The meeting heard from policy officers from the ACT Government involved in recent deliberative engagement processes:

- Better Suburbs Citizens' Forum: Naomi Lee, Policy Lead, Better Suburbs, Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate;
- Housing Choices Collaboration Hub: Bohdana Szydluk, Senior Community Engagement Officer, Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate;
- Compulsory Third-Party Insurance Citizens' Jury: Cecilia Willis, previously Senior Policy Officer, CTP Insurance, Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate;
- Carers' Voice Panel: Karen Baumgart, Senior Policy Officer and Erin-Claire Barrow, Policy Officer, Community Services Directorate.

A summary of the design of each of the processes, including recruitment, remit, process and output is at [Attachment A](#).

Group breakout discussions

The room broke up into two groups and participants were given the opportunity to talk about processes they had been involved in and to ask questions of the policy officers.

Some of the reflections and questions that came out of the discussions included:

General

- It is good to see government experimenting in deliberative democracy.
- We need to share success stories.
- We need to reflect on the practice.
- We are heading in a positive direction with increased community participation in the policy decision making process.

Recruitment

- You have to have a good mix of people.
- Participating in the process requires a big commitment. This would restrict some people's involvement.
- A good sized group for consultation is 50-60. This way it can be demographically representative and small enough so that members can feel comfortable within the environment.
- Would it be possible to recruit participants based on educational level/socio-economic status as well as age, gender and suburb? How are marginalised voices included?
- Should seasoned participants be excluded?

Topic

- Could citizens get to choose a topic for a deliberative engagement process?
- These processes can work for complex topics if there is a good process design.

Process

- I trusted the process I was involved in but I didn't in the beginning.
- The facilitator challenged us to think critically. I wanted to have an informed opinion. It is important that we are not wasting people's time.
- What is the ideal time-frame to hold a consultative process for?

Output

- I am learning how a deliberative process can work in a policy setting; how it can reach a diverse audience.
- Trust is so important. You destroy trust through ignoring what people have to say.
- We need to close the loop.
- Sometimes for participants, being part of the engagement process is a benefit in itself.
- We have learnt from these deliberative engagement processes that citizens are more than capable of making decisions – it strengthens trust between government and community.

Further reading

You can explore more these deliberative processes by visiting:

Carers' Strategy (<http://www.communityservices.act.gov.au/home/act-carers-strategy-2018-2028/act-carers-strategy>)

Better Suburbs (<https://www.yoursay.act.gov.au/BetterSuburbs>)

Citizens' Jury on Compulsory Third Party Insurance (<https://www.yoursay.act.gov.au/ctp>)

Housing Choices (<https://www.yoursay.act.gov.au/housing-choices>)

Wrap-up

Members were encouraged to sign up for YourSay updates to find out about engagement processes being run by the ACT Government. Anyone can sign up at <https://yoursay.act.gov.au/about>

Canberra Alliance for Participatory Democracy invited everyone to their next 'Hearing the Voice of Participants' antipasto and discussion on Thursday 1st November to listen to participant's experiences of the 'Better Suburbs' Citizen's process. RSVP here:

[Hearing the Voice of Participants: Canberra's next Citizen's Forum on 'Better Suburbs' Tickets, Thurs 1st Nov 5:30 pm - 8:30 pm | Humanitix](#)

Next Meeting – 22 November 2018, 5.30pm – 7.00pm. This will be the last meeting of the year and will consider recent processes through the lens of the Principles/Criteria for the Trial of Citizens' Juries in the ACT – Jointly prepared by the Canberra Alliance for Participatory Democracy (CAPaD) and the ACT Council of Social Service Inc (ACTCOSS).

Future topics

These topics were brought up at a previous meeting. They have been kept here as a reference. We have themed these comments:

Deliberation & methods

- Have an experience of “Deep Democracy” (the Lewis method) <https://deep-democracy.net/category/deep-democracy-basics/>
- Would like an experience of methods
- How to design deliberative mini-publics
- I'm interested to explore the Arnstein/gap model - <http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.html>
- Can the topic be too broad for a citizens' jury?
- (After a mini-public) How do we know if there has been actual “deliberation”?
- Ethical values and the common good
- Deliberative processes require slower decision-making. Time to think and learn. Time to listen. Time to deliberate. How do we make time?
- How to engage young people in political processes
- What methods will reach the people?

Community capacity building

- Is/can deliberation achieve bipartisan support
- Talking about vs. talking to create futures
- The role of media in promotion and acceptance of participative processes
- How are the topics for a citizens' jury decided? Does the topic need to match the type of process?
- When and how will the government partner with civil society to choose a topic for a participatory process?
- How can we encourage Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders into deliberations? We need more relationship focus
- How do we get the politics to buy in?
- Explore funding opportunities for collaboration between researchers and practitioners of deliberative democracy
- How to increase citizens' trust in other types of participatory innovations? (without the specific function of participatory budgeting)
- What does a good relationship look like?

Case studies

- We can report on our deliberation in schools next year (Wendy)
- Invite researchers from Centre of Deliberative Democracy to present findings in deliberative democracy
- Deliberative processes in extremely polarised societies
- Showcase successful cases of deliberation in Australia and the world
- Lessons from citizen-government engagement failures
- What could ACT do to learn and improve on its current activities?
- How to really get citizens involved in an authoritarian state?

Further Reading

<https://www.citizensassembly.ie/en/>

Participedia - <https://participedia.net/>

Further listening

Real Democracy Now podcast - <http://realdemocracynow.com.au/>

Centre for Public Impact - <https://www.centreforpublicimpact.org/podcast/>

ATTACHMENT A: SUMMARY OF THE DESIGN OF RECENT ACT DELIBERATIVE ENGAGEMENT PROCESSES

	Better Suburbs	Housing Choices	Compulsory Third Party Insurance (CTP) Citizens' Jury	Carers Voice Panel
Recruitment	<p>Planned forum size: up to 65. 4,000 postal invitations, 1,000 email invitations and additional printed invitations were distributed via youth organisations to encourage young people to participate.</p> <p>There were 54 forum members - 49 randomly selected citizens and 6 community council representatives. The members were selected to match ACT demographics.</p>	<p>15,000 invitations were sent via Australia Post and a group of 38 citizens was brought together for the Collaboration Hub.</p>	<p>Planned jury size: 50</p> <p>Australia Post randomly selected 6,000 households to receive invitations. A further 1,500 individuals were randomly selected from the Vote Compass database to receive online invitations. Random selection from RSVPs to match ACT demographics.</p>	<p>Carers and other members of the community were invited to register their interest in participating in the Panel, through invitations sent by Carers ACT to their database of 6,000 carers and an ACT Government media call.</p> <p>Of the 98 people who registered their interest, 64 were invited to participate and 49 attended. The majority of these were carers.</p>
Scope/ topic Remit/task	<p>The Forum deliberated on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A vision for city servicing in Canberra 2. An agreed view about the current level and quality of the city services delivered 3. The necessary priorities for service improvement 4. The allocation of funding for playground infrastructure improvements 5. Insights to assist in planning more participatory decision- 	<p>The Collaboration Hub followed an initial public engagement phase using a discussion paper.</p> <p>The Collaboration Hub members were immersed in all aspects of planning and development in the ACT and considered the question: Canberra is changing – and there are many different ways our housing needs can be met. What do we need to do?</p>	<p>Community feedback was sought to feed into a two phase jury approach:</p> <p>Phase 1 remit: Priorities for an improved CTP scheme.</p> <p>Phase 2 remit: Select from 4 models the one that best meets the priorities set in phase 1.</p>	<p>Members of the Carers Voice Panel were asked to consider three questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the panel's vision for a carer friendly city? 2. What outcomes do we want to see for carers? 3. What should our shared priorities be?

	making activities in the future.			
Duration/ Process/ Facilitation / design process	<p>The main Better Suburbs Forum was held over five days July-August 2018 (across three weekends).</p> <p>Facilitation methods included a bus tour; presentations from experts; slow dialogues; interactive and ongoing feedback from TCCS, and systems thinking.</p> <p>The main days activities were:</p> <p>Day 1: bus tour</p> <p>Day 2 slow dialogues as deep dive into the knowledge about city service</p> <p>Day 3: Systems thinking and writing of the Statement</p> <p>Day 4: Recommendations for each of the service areas</p> <p>Day 5: Completion of the Statement, first day of Play Spaces deliberation, presentation to the Minister</p>	<p>Five days (on weekends), interspersed with three-week intervening periods in May-July 2018.</p> <p>Stakeholder Reference Group put forward their recommendation for expert speakers and their own written positions. The Group met on three occasions.</p> <p>Facilitation methods included hearing from industry and government representatives.</p>	<p>Six days in total. Two weekends in October 2017 for Phase 1 and one weekend in March 2018 for Phase 2.</p> <p>Stakeholder Reference Group (SRG) provided detailed input to scheme designer on models.</p> <p>Facilitation methods included world café with SRG members; jury selection of witnesses; and consensus techniques.</p>	<p>The deliberative process was designed by democracyCo, in consultation with the ACT Government and Carers ACT, to ensure inclusive, informed discussion of complex issues.</p> <p>democracyCo facilitated two days of deliberation by the Carers Voice Panel in October 2017.</p> <p>Facilitation methods included large and small group discussions and presentations by relevant academics, community sector and Government officials. Methods also included open space technology, carer story telling narratives, collaborative development of ideas and consensus techniques. An important element of facilitation was recognition that most panel members had lived experience and significant knowledge of the subject matter under discussion.</p>

<p>Output/ report/ authority</p>	<p>The Forum produced the Better Suburbs Statement including a visionary statement to 2030 and a statement of priorities to 2022; made recommendations on individual service areas; developed a priorities framework for play spaces; and gave feedback on community involvement in decision making.</p> <p>The Statement was tabled in the ACT Legislative Assembly on 18 September 2018. The development of action plans to progress the priorities in the Statement is underway as is the completion of the participatory budgeting for play spaces.</p>	<p>The unedited recommendations of the Collaboration Hub were presented to the Minister in person. Government committed to a written response to the recommendations, with an initial Directorate response within 45 days, followed by a full response over the coming year.</p> <p>In September 2018, the ACT Government agreed in-principle to the 13 recommendations on housing choices provided by the Collaboration Hub.</p>	<p>Phase 1: Jury produced a report on priorities for a new CTP scheme. This was used as the brief for the scheme designer and SRG. The scheme designer produced a report on 4 models and the actuary produced a costings report.</p> <p>Phase 2: Jury produced a report outlining the reasons for selecting the preferred model. This included a minority report.</p> <p>Government committed at the commencement to pursue the model preferred by the jury.</p>	<p>Following the Panel's deliberations, a small group of panel members was approved by the larger group to develop a report on the Panel's findings. The <i>Carers Voice Panel Report</i> was developed with input from the full Panel by online communication.</p> <p>The <i>Government Vision, Priorities and Outcomes Statement</i> was developed in response to this report and included much of the original language of the Report. Both the Report and the Statement were launched at an official event in December 2017. Together, these documents form the framework for the Strategy.</p> <p>The Strategy will be supported by the first three-year Action Plan, developed in 2018 by a taskforce that included representatives from Government, the community sector and the carer community. The Action Plan was launched on 16 October 2018.</p>
--	---	---	--	---