**Genuine Engagement Tool (GET) Template**

**Name of Participatory Process:**

**Location of the Engagement Process:**

**Type of Process (eg. Citizens Jury, deliberative process, consultation process):**

**Date:**

**Evaluating body / group:**

Here is a link to the 11 [OECD Good Practice Principles for Deliberative Processes for Public Decision Making](https://www.oecd.org/gov/open-government/good-practice-principles-for-deliberative-processes-for-public-decision-making.pdf) that form the framework for this assessment. From 2020 report [Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions](https://www.oecd.org/gov/innovative-citizen-participation-and-new-democratic-institutions-339306da-en.htm).

For a brief evaluation, you may want to just use the first column (Principles); however, a richer analysis comes from working through the entire document.

Please use and [feedback to us](mailto:secretary@canberra-alliance.org.au) what you think and how it worked.

Quick visual assessment (traffic light) model involves highlighting evidence in into 3 colour categories:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Green = | clear evidence that the criteria has been met |
| Orange = | more evidence needed to establish if the criteria has been met |
| Red = | no evidence available or the evidence indicates the criteria has not been met |
| Blank = | criteria not applicable |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **OECD good practice principle** | **Criteria** | **Evidence** |
| **Principle 1: Purpose**  The objective should be outlined as a clear task and is linked to a defined public problem. It is phrased neutrally as a question in plain language. | 1A What is the objective for participants to deliberate on and who formulated it? |  |
| 1B Is the objective outlined as a clear task? |  |
| 1C Is the objective linked to a defined public problem? |  |
| 1D Is the objective phrased neutrally? |  |
| 1E Is the objective posed as a question in plain language?? |  |
| **Principle 2: Accountability**  There should be influence on public decisions. The commissioning public authority should publicly commit to responding to or acting on participants’ recommendations in a timely manner.  It should monitor the implementation of all accepted recommendations with regular public progress reports. | 2A Who is the commissioning authority? |  |
| 2B Has the commissioning authority publicly committed to responding to, or acting upon, participants’ recommendations? |  |
| 2C Has the commissioning authority committed to responding within a specified time frame? |  |
| 2D Will the commissioning authority be monitoring the implementation of accepted recommendations with regular progress reports? |  |
| **Principle 3: Transparency**  The deliberative process should be announced publicly before it begins. The process design and all materials – including agendas, briefing documents, evidence submissions, audio and video recordings of those presenting evidence, the participants’ report, their recommendations (the wording of which participants should have a final say over), and the random selection methodology – should be available to the public in a timely manner.  The funding source should be disclosed. The commissioning public authority’s response to the recommendations and the evaluation after the process should be publicised and have a public communication strategy. | 3A Was the deliberative process announced publicly before it began? |  |
| 3B Has the process design been available to the public, and if so, since when? |  |
| 3C Have all materials been materials been made available to the public in a timely manner:   1. agendas & briefing documents? 2. evidence submissions, audio and video recordings of those presenting evidence 3. evidence of the random selection methodology? 4. Participants’ Report including their recommendations? |  |
| 3D Did Participants have the final say in the wording of their report? |  |
| 3E Was the funding source disclosed before the process began? |  |
| 3F Will the commissioning authority’s response to the recommendations be publicised as part of a public communications strategy? |  |
| 3G Will the evaluation(s), after the process, be publicised as part of a communications strategy? |  |
| **Principle 4: Inclusiveness**  Inclusion should be achieved by considering how to involve underrepresented groups. Participation should also be encouraged and supported through remuneration, expenses, and/or providing or paying for childcare and eldercare. | 4A What consideration was made of how to include under-represented groups? |  |
| 4B Was participation encouraged and supported through renumeration of expenses and/or provision or paying for childcare and eldercare? |  |
| **Principle 5: Representativeness**  The participants should be a microcosm of the general public. This is achieved through random sampling from which a representative selection is made, based on stratification by demographics (to ensure the group broadly matches the demographic profile of the community against census or other similar data), and sometimes by attitudinal criteria (depending on the context). Everyone should have an equal opportunity to be selected as participants. In some instances, it may be desirable to over-sample certain demographics during the random sampling stage of recruitment to help achieve representativeness. | 5A Was a process of random sampling and demographic stratification used to attain a participant body that was a microcosm of the general public? |  |
| 5B Did everyone have equal opportunity to be selected as a participant? |  |
| 5C Were any demographic group over-sampled during the random sampling stage of recruitment to help achieve representativeness? |  |
| **Principle 6: Information**  Participants should have access to a wide range of accurate, relevant, and accessible evidence and expertise.  They should have the opportunity to hear from and question speakers that present to them, including experts and advocates chosen by the citizens themselves. | 6A Did Participants have access to a wide range of accurate, relevant and accessible evidence and expertise? |  |
| 6B Did Participants have an opportunity to hear from experts and advocates of their own choosing? |  |
| **Principle 7: Group Deliberation**  Participants should be able to find common ground to underpin their collective recommendations to the public authority.  This entails careful and active listening, weighing and considering multiple perspectives, every participant having an opportunity to speak, a mix of formats that alternate between small group and plenary discussions and activities, and skilled facilitation. | 7A Did the deliberation entail careful and active listening? |  |
| 7B Did the deliberation entail weighing up and consideration of multiple perspectives? |  |
| 7C Did the deliberation entail opportunity for everyone to speak? |  |
| 7D Did the deliberation entail a mix of formats alternating between small group and plenary discussions and activities? |  |
| 7E Was the deliberation facilitated skilfully? |  |
| **Principle 8: Time**  Deliberation requires adequate time for participants to learn, weigh the evidence, and develop informed recommendations, due to the complexity of most policy problems. To achieve informed citizen recommendations, participants should meet for at least four full days in person, unless a shorter time frame can be justified. It is recommended to allow time for individual learning and reflection in between meetings. | 8A Was there adequate time for Participants to learn, weigh the evidence and develop informed recommendations? |  |
| 8B Did Participants meet for at least four full days? |  |
| 8C Did Participants meet in person? |  |
| 8D Was time allowed for individual learning and reflection in between meetings? |  |
| **Principle 9: Integrity**  The process should be run by an arms’ length co-ordinating team different from the commissioning public authority. The final call regarding process decisions should be with the arm’s length co-ordinators rather than the commissioning authorities. Depending on the context, there should be oversight by an advisory or monitoring board with representatives of different viewpoints. | 9A Was the process run by an arm’s length coordinating team different from the commissioning body? |  |
| 9B Was the final call regarding process decisions rest with coordinators rather than the commissioning authority? |  |
| 9C Was there oversight (of the process) by an advisory or monitoring board with representatives of different viewpoints? |  |
| **Principle 10: Privacy**  There should be respect for participants’ privacy to protect them from undesired media attention and harassment, as well as to preserve participants’ independence, ensuring they are not bribed or lobbied by interest groups or activists. Small group discussions should be private. The identity of participants may be publicised when the process has ended, at the participants’ consent. All personal data of participants should be treated in compliance with international good practices, such as the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). | 10A Were Participants protected from undesired media attention and harassment? |  |
| 10B Was Participants’ independence preserved by ensuring they could not be bribed or lobbied by interest groups or activists? |  |
| 10C Was Participants’ consent sought before making their identities public after the process had concluded? |  |
| 10D Was all personal data of Participants treated in compliance with international good practices? |  |
| **Principle 11: Evaluation**  There should be an anonymous evaluation by the participants to assess the process based on objective criteria (e.g. on quantity and diversity of information provided, amount of time devoted to learning, independence of facilitation). An internal evaluation by the co-ordination team should be conducted against the good practice principles in this report to assess what has been achieved and how to improve future practice.  An independent evaluation is recommended for some deliberative processes, particularly those that last a significant time. The deliberative process should also be evaluated on final outcomes and impact of implemented recommendations. | 11A Was an anonymous evaluation completed by Participants to assess the Deliberative Process, based on objective criteria (eg on the quantity and diversity of information provided, amount of time devoted to learning, independence of facilitation)? |  |
| 11B Is an internal evaluation being conducted by the co-ordination team against the OECD good practice Principles, to assess what has been achieved and how to improve future practice? |  |
| 11C Is an independent evaluation being conducted? |  |
| 11D Will the deliberative process be evaluated on final outcomes and the impact of implemented recommendations? |  |
| **Principle 12: Impact**  The project should demonstrate a positive impact in the community and educate the community about the value of the process and citizen deliberation | Are actions planned to educate the community about the value of the process and citizen deliberation? |  |