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1. Background

1.1. Citizen engagement in cohesion policy: partnership between the OECD and the European Commission

The European Commission has partnered with the OECD since July 2020 to explore the different ways five authorities across Europe could bring citizens to the centre of their investment decisions. The pilot project is aiming at championing active engagement of citizens and civil society in the implementation of cohesion policy. The EU’s cohesion policy aims to strengthen economic and social cohesion by reducing disparities in the level of development between regions. Five organisations were selected to take part in the project: Regione Emilia-Romagna in Italy, Regional Ministry of Cantabria in Spain, Centre for EU Transport Projects in Poland, Interreg V-A Flanders – The Netherlands programme, and Interreg V-A Romania-Bulgaria Programme.

The OECD’s Open Government team is providing selected organisations with expert support and tailored assistance to explore innovative ways of engaging citizens and civil society in decisions of strategic importance for the implementation of operational programmes on a national or regional level. The experiences from the project will contribute to the broader set of recommendations on the ways to improve, expand, and strengthen the efforts of managing authorities and intermediate bodies to engage citizens and civil society in the implementation of cohesion policy across the European Union.

1.2. European Funds in Cantabria Government

In February 2020, the Government of Cantabria (north of Spain), through its Department of Economy and Finance\(^1\), and focusing on the transition towards a green economy with low carbon emissions, applied to the Call organized by the OECD and the Commission. The project was selected in July 2020.

\(^1\) The Minister of Economy and Finance is María Sánchez Ruíz (PSC-PSOE), which is part of the government of Miguel Ángel Revilla (PRC) with Pablo Zuloaga (PSOE) as vice president. PRC (15 deputies) and PSOE (6) have formed a government coalition since May 2019 (absolute majority of 18 deputies). The General Director of Services and Citizen Participation, Alicia Solar, reports to the Council of the Presidency (PRC). She was informed at the beginning of the project and supported it without getting involved. In opposition are the Partido Popular (9) Ciudadanos (3) and VOX (2). The mandate of this government ends in May 2023. Please see more details in the Annex 7.1.
The Regional Ministry of Economy is responsible for co-ordinating and preparing the region’s various investment programmes, including the European Regional Development Fund and European Social Fund investment plan for 2021–2027.

Within the region, ten municipalities located in Besaya’s basin are in the process of transitioning to a greener, low carbon economy. This move poses economic challenges and requires a broad public conversation — to identify the values on which the future of the area will be built, a common vision, and the way forward to get there.

As the transition will affect everyone in the area, all groups and communities should have a chance to put forward their point of view and take part in the decision-making process.

The 2020 OECD Deliberative Wave report suggests that representative deliberative processes (such as Citizens’ Juries) are especially well placed to give citizens a voice in tackling complex, long-term issues. In a Citizens’ Jury, public authorities convene a group of people representing a wide cross-section of society for numerous days to learn, deliberate, and develop collective recommendations that consider the complexities and compromises required for solving multifaceted public issues.

After several meetings with Claudia Chwalisz and Ieva Cesnulaityte, on behalf of the OECD, the Cantabria Government decided to initiate a deliberative process in the Besaya Region.

---

2 Participo / OECD, Citizens at the heart of investment decisions, Ieva Cesnulaityte, May 11, 2021
2. Preparing for the Citizens’ Jury

Before the Jury starts working, extensive preparation is required.

2.1. Defining the task / question

New European funds are foreseen in Cantabria for the period 2021-2027, which will be invested in the Besaya region according to three objectives:

- (A) The investment should help reduce net greenhouse gas emissions to zero greenhouse in 2050;
- (B) Economic growth should not be linked to the use of non-renewable resources;
- (C) Reduce inequality between urban and rural communities.

In this context, after series of meetings between the OECD and Cantabria Government, the question defined for the Citizen’s Jury was: **How to take advantage of European green funds in the Besaya basin to create and / or maintain jobs that respect the criteria of a just and inclusive ecological transition?**

Its recommendations will inform the strategic vision of Cantabria’s Government, prioritizing the sectors to be supported, the measures to be adopted and the projects to be promoted.

The main task of the citizen jury will be focused on shaping and prioritizing the criteria and areas of application of the actions to be carried out through the ERDF and ESF funds for the period 2021 to 2027.

The government, considering it was a pilot action, decided to organise the Jury in **ten municipalities** of the Region, around Torrelavega, which are home to some 100,000 inhabitants.

2.2. Governance

Management

This initiative is promoted, coordinated, and organized by the Ministry of Economy and Finance of the Government of Cantabria. The General Directorate of European Funds and the Office of European Projects of the Government of Cantabria are in charge of the management, communication and validation of the different stages of the deliberative process.
The main responsible of the Citizens’ jury project is Mª Paz Díaz Nieto, Director of European Funds, together with Hector Sánchez, director of the Cantabrian Institute of Statistics, César Aja Ortega (PSOE) Director of the Cantabria Management Agency; Cesar is also secretary of municipal politics of the Cantabrian PSOE. Other employees of the Cantabrian government, who have also been very active during the process: Chelo Hospital, Head of the Office for European Affairs, mainly to contract providers and resolve administrative matters; David San Juan Escudero, recently hired at the same office, being the main coordinator; Cristina Ganzo, in charge of the relations with members of the Jury; and Adrián Marcos in charge of Communication.

Monitoring

A Monitoring group (Grupo de seguimiento) made up of ten people³ (and in addition three members from the Government) who represent a diverse representation of the social, political and academic actors of Besaya was set up to ensure the neutrality of the process and the diversity of the information given to the Jury. The group met 4 times (April 21, May 5, 12 and 26). They were continuously informed about the whole design of the process (civic lottery, working sessions) and the content of it (who are the group of experts, who are the proposed speakers, etc.), and were asked to comment on them.

Monitoring Group

| Regional Administration: | Agustín Ibañez, General Director of CIMA (Centro de investigación del medio ambiente). |
| - | Héctor Sánchez, Director of the Cantabrian Institute of Statistics. |
| - | Ma Paz Díaz Nieto, Director of European Funds of the Government of Cantabria. |
| Local Administration: | Constantino Fernández, Mayor of Villaescusa. |
| - | Julián Rozas, Comillas City Councillor. |
| Academia: | Amaia Lobo, Professor of the Department of Water and Environmental Sciences and Techniques, ETS Ingenieros de Caminos, Canales y Puertos |

³ 2 politicians from City Councils; 3 academics; 5 civil society representatives (Chamber of Commerce; Centre for Entrepreneurship; Professional Union, Syndicate, Green NGO)

Soledad Nogués, GEURBAN group Director, Professor of Urban Planning and Territorial Organisation, ETS Ingenieros de Caminos, Canales y Puertos

Civil Society:

Carlos Augusto, Torrelavega Chamber of Commerce
José Carlos Ceballos, CISE- UCEIF Foundation
Luis Vellido, Cantabria Professional Union.
Mónica Calonge, UGT Cantabria
Ramón Sainz, Ecologists in Action of Cantabria.

Design and content

The process is initiated by the Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy of the European Commission. The Open Government and Civic Space unit of the OECD (Claudia Chwalisz and Ieva Cesnulaityte) and Deliberativa association (Arantxa Mendiharat, contracted by the OECD, and Yago Bermejo) provides advice and technical assistance to design the process and the contents in order to ensure a fair representation of all parties involved. They are advised by a group of experts on environmental, economic, social and European issues.

Management of European programs: Beatriz Bearraondo, Specialist monitoring the European Social Fund.
Rosa María Izquierdo, Deputy Director of European Funds.

Economics / economic impact

Adela Sánchez, Economist, European projects and business development consultant. Enterprise Europe Network Project Manager. Associate Professor, Business Administration Department, University of Cantabria.
Angel Herrero Crespo, Professor of Commercialisation and Markets Investigation, University of Cantabria.
Jesús Collado, Professor and Chair of the Business Administration Department, University of Cantabria.

Environment

Cliona Howie, in charge of development and transition to circular economy of EIT Climate-KIC.
Felipe González, Founder of “Bruma, sostenibilidad y participación ciudadana S.L.”. Expert in the advice, design and promotion of environmental policies.

The group of experts includes one representative of the political office and one technician in charge of European funds at Cantabria government, three academics from the Economy Department of Cantabria University, two experts specialised in the field of environment (one responsible for Circular Economy at EIT Climate-KIC; one from an NGO focused on environment). They were remunerated by the public authority (800 euros each).
The group gathered 8 times (April 16, 22, 30, May 7, 13, 17, 19, 25) and had mainly 2 tasks:

- To define the experts that could be heard by the Jury in order to have a global knowledge about employment and ecological transition; they proposed the 10 experts that intervened on days 2 and 4.
- To analyse the projects presented in the website. They did a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the projects, in terms of job creation, environmental impact and alignment to the criteria of the European funds.

2.3. Facilitation and other service providers

Facilitation

During the working sessions, the Citizens’ Jury was assisted by five professional facilitators from Pez Estudio (two from Bilbao, one from Madrid, one from a nearby region, and one from Torrelavega), who ensured the smooth running of the deliberative process. They co-designed the whole process, accompanied the collaborative learning, proposed decision-making tools and guaranteed respect and inclusiveness in the dialogue. When working in groups of seven, one facilitator was present in each of the groups.

Other services

Three organisations were also hired by the public authority (after a call for tenders) to carry out the stratification of the civic lottery (Sortition Foundation), to install the Decidim digital platform (Platoniq) and for the graphic design and video editing (How are you). A local facilitator (Jaime Gutierrez Bayo), contracted by the OECD, also helped promote the call for projects among local actors.

2.4. Steps leading up to the working sessions

Website

The website had three main functions:

- to foster transparency, with a complete presentation of the process including governance, calendar, projects submitted by local actors, conferences given by experts during the process;
- to allow potential members of the jury that received an invitation letter to register (it was also possible to register by phone);
- to organise the call for projects to local actors that could fit into ERDF and ESF funds.

Platoniq installed Decidim digital software to allow the government to tune the website and insert contents.

Civic Lottery
To select the 35 members of the Jury, 7,002 letters, signed by the Minister of Economy and Finance, were sent to randomly selected postal addresses from the ten participating municipalities. Anyone receiving the invitation could volunteer to participate in the Citizens’ Jury.

210 people applied (3% of the 7,000 letters sent) and a second civic lottery was held combined with demographic stratification. Five criteria were defined for stratification: gender, age, education, municipality and values related to environment and participation. The final sample of participants was descriptive of the Besaya basin.

The first civic lottery was carried out on March 19, 2021 by the director of the Cantabrian Institute of Statistics in front of public officials. Then, through a program that generated random numbers, 7,002 valid addresses were selected, proportional to the population of the ten municipalities.

The stratification took place on May 4, with the help of Sortition Foundation. They have shared the “Stratified Select Software”, which has a publicly available code, to the Cantabria Government for any future use they might want to conduct on its own in the future.

Due to the nature of the population in Besaya region, the recruitment process faced an important bias in several criteria. Different issues were detected during the recruitment process:

- It was difficult to get responses from those over 70 years of age, who made up almost 20% of the total population.
- It was very difficult to get responses from the population without a school diploma. This could be due to the fact that many of them probably had difficulties reading the invitation and possibly were elderly inhabitants. This quota of 18% of participants with no formal education was impossible to obtain and was replaced by people who’s highest attained education was a school diploma. For future processes, we recommend street or door-to-door contact in areas of recruitment with a potentially low educational level.
- It was difficult to recruit people with a negative attitude towards civic associations (the most common form of citizen participation asked about in the survey) and with lower levels of environmental awareness.

Please see the Annexes for more information about the civic lottery.
35 people were selected and 31 confirmed their participation in the first round of calls. The final list of participants was published on May 7, 2021. Each member of the Jury was remunerated for their time with 444 euros, to ensure that everyone had equal opportunities to participate.

A printed copy of the Information kit was sent to participants one week before the Jury started.

The demographic and attitudinal characteristics are detailed in the graphs provided by the Sortition Foundation, where we can see the characteristics of the target population, those of the registered participants and those of the selected people:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>SELECTED (ORIGINAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mujer</td>
<td>Varón</td>
<td>Mujer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>SELECTED (ORIGINAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80+</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>60-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>SELECTED (ORIGINAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachil</td>
<td>Graduo</td>
<td>Bachil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menos</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>Menos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDE</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>SELECTED (ORIGINAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mucho</td>
<td>Indef.</td>
<td>Mucho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poco</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>Poco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILDREN UNDER 18</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>SELECTED (ORIGINAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl fami</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>Sl fami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl fami</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Sl fami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOGRAPHY</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>SELECTED (ORIGINAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cartes</td>
<td>Los Cot.</td>
<td>Torela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Cot.</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>Torela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ponce</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suacez</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Call for projects at besayaeuropa.es

In order to support the Citizens’ Jury work with examples grounded in their territory, a call for projects was organised during April 2021. The call encouraged local actors to present projects that would at the same time generate employment, respect the green transition, and would meet the criteria to apply to European funds (ERDF and ESF).

A local facilitator, Jaime Gutierrez Bayo, got in touch with more than 200 local organisations. 58 high quality projects were received from private and public agents that were taken into consideration by the Citizens’ Jury as examples of projects that could be developed.

[Website: projects presented by local agents]
3. Jury’s Working sessions

3.1. Calendar

Because of the COVID pandemic, the process had to be online, and because of European funds calendar, it was recommended to end before July 2021. This is why we established 12 relatively short sessions (2h 30 on Fridays and 4h on Saturdays), with only one week in between, in the following days:

- Sessions 1 and 2: Friday, May 28, Saturday May 29.
- Sessions 3 and 4: Friday, June 4, Saturday June 5.
- Sessions 5 and 6: Friday, June 11, Saturday June 12.
- Sessions 7 and 8: Friday, June 25, Saturday June 26.
- Sessions 9 and 10: Friday, July 2, Saturday July 3.
- Session 11 and 12: Friday, July 9, Saturday, July 10.

The sessions represent a total amount of 39 hours.

3.2. Participation of the members of the Jury

Digital mediation

10 of the 35 jury members did not have access to digital means. Torrelavega City Council hired an Academy in the center of the city to host the 10 persons, with a person in charge of helping them connect to the computers and manage the Zoom videoconferencing platform. David San Juan from the Government was also present, managing the Zoom application.

Drop out

35 members started the process and 29 finished it. Five people dropped out because they started activities that were not compatible with the timetables of the jury; one dropped out because she felt the work was too technical and she thought she could not follow it through. The most problematic profile that dropped out was a young person under 20; there were only two persons with this profile in the Jury and she could not be replaced (no one else with her characteristics was available in the reserve list).

Group rotations

The subgroups rotated only once, in the middle of the process (June 11). Given the profile of the participants, and the fact that the process was online, facilitators and participants asked to maintain a certain stability and thought more rotations would harm the process.
In-person meetings

On Days 9 and 10, the meetings were organised in-person in Torrelavega. Members very much welcomed being able to meet in-person. However, six people the first day and four on the second day asked to participate online. They were connected with the physical place through a screen. The first day the meeting coincided with Spain playing in the quarter finals of the European Football Championship and yet everyone was present. The participants in Torrelavega watched the overtime of the game on the rooftop terrace bar of the building.

3.3. Content of the sessions

The sessions were organised using Zoom videoconference tool and Miro to share the information.

The process was organised as follows:

- **Day 1**: presentation of the process and of the tools (Zoom, Miro); ice breaking; cognitive bias and critical thought; initial vision. Cognitive biases were recorded by the facilitators along the whole process at the end of each weekend.
- **Day 2**: five expert presentations about the context (ecological transition, reality of the territory, business transition to economically neutral models, diagnosis of the Besaya concerning the environment, objectives of the ecological transition investments in the Besaya Region).
- **Day 3**: expert presentations about European funds (given by Paz Díaz, from the Cantabria Government).
- **Day 4**: five expert presentations about specific areas for ecological transition (renewable energies, circular economy, green infrastructure, urban mobility, sustainable water management and adaptation to climate change).

Expert presentations were expected to be five minutes long; then the members of the jury had 20-30 minutes to exchange about the presentations in breakout sessions, formulate questions and pose them to the experts in plenary. When the experts did not have enough time to answer the questions, they would send it in writing after. The answers were sent by email to participants who had email accounts and by post to the others; some answers were also read during plenaries in the sessions that followed.

- **Day 5**: elaboration of an informed vision of the Besaya in 2030.
Day 6: finishing elaborating the informed vision; analysis of the projects received during the online submission and relating them to the informed vision.

Day 7: revision of the informed vision from the employment point of view; evaluation of how the process is going.

Day 8: working on the informed vision by prioritising and choosing strategic fields regarding employment and ecological transition; two more experts were requested by the Jury, on the rentability of ecological projects, and on the conversion of industrial fields;

Day 9 (in person): exchange with the government (Paz Díaz, Héctor Sánchez, César Aja).

Day 10 (in person): two expert presentations that were requested on Day 8; prioritisation of strategic areas and projects.

Day 11: finalization and revision of recommendations.

Day 12: voting on each of the recommendations. Decision made by the group that only recommendations with more than 80% support are included as the main recommendations.

3.4. Results

The results are:

1) A report of Jury’s recommendations that includes Strategic Priorities, with 25 recommendations approved with more than 80% of the votes (we only mention here the main titles and not the details of the recommendations):


● Strategy 3: Blue Heritage (6 recommendations).
   It includes: Litoral, Forestry and Hydrology.

2) Supporting documentation of the process:

● Strategic Priorities. Recommendations with less than 80% approval
  ○ Strategy 1: Industrial Conversion and Circular Economy (2 recommendations)
  ○ Strategy 2: Environment and Renewable Energies (3 recommendations)
  ○ Strategy 3: Blue Heritage (1 recommendation)

● Strategic Priorities: Recommendations that did not get the majority of the votes: 2

● Illustrative proposals for Strategic Priorities (all available in besayaeuropa.es)
  ○ Projects selected by 5 sub-groups:
    ■ 55 Rehabilitation of Obsolete Industrial Areas

  ○ Projects selected by 4 sub-groups:
    ■ 24 Pole of Research and Development In Renewable Energies
    ■ 25 Scientific-technological Park Specialising in Circular Economy and Bioeconomy
    ■ 40 Implementation of Training Courses in Renewable Energies in Besaya
    ■ 50 Recovery of Degraded Areas for the Protection of Biodiversity as well as the Generation of Green Jobs
    ■ F2 Besaya/Saya Vertebral Axis

  ○ Projects selected by 3 sub-groups:
    ■ F1 Improvement of Sustainability and Promotion of the Circular Economy in a Manufacture of Plastic Packaging.
    ■ 26 Besaya Smart Industrial City. Sustainable and Intelligent Productive Areas
    ■ 48 Creation of two Agri-food Industrial Estates in The Vegas De Tanos (Torrelavega) and Barros (Los Corrales De Buelna): a model applicable to Cantabria
    ■ 22 Local Ecological Agriculture

● Complementary Areas: A Vision

4. Communication and follow up

4.1. Communication

When the Jury was in its preparation phase:

● Two online meetings were organised in March with local stakeholders in order to inform them about the process and encourage them to apply to the call for projects.

● A press conference was organised in Torrelavega, on April 13, with the participation of the Minister of Economy and Finance, the Mayor of Torrelavega, Claudia Chwalisz from the OECD, and Arantxa
Mendiharat from Deliberativa. The main objective was to inform about the process and to encourage Besaya’s residents to apply if they received the invitation letter.

- A twitter account was created by the Government, Besaya delibera en Europa @BesayaEuropa, managed by Adrian Marcos.
- Three videos were released: interviews after the press conference, a general presentation of the process, and a short video aimed at older people to encourage them to respond in the case they received the invitation.
- A video with a resume of the work of the jury is expected to be released soon.

4.2. Press and social media coverage

Media coverage⁵ has been mainly limited to local media, with publications based on press releases. Social media has shown little coverage. Press and social media coverage mainly covers the work of the jury and the relationships created between the local government and the OECD, the European Commission and regional governments in Spain interested by the experience.

4.3. Follow up

The government’s commitment at the beginning of the project was to produce written responses to the recommendations one month after their publication, 6 months after (January 2022) and 18 months after (October 2022).

A public event was organised on the 30 September 2021, as a first validation and recognition of the results, with the participation of the regional Minister of Economy and Finance, and more than 20 jury’s members attending both physically and remotely.

As of February 2022, the government has not yet given official response to the recommendations, saying that “as the European Funds DG is still preparing the elaboration and implementation of ERDF and ESF programmes, it is not possible to arrange a second meeting (...) due to the early stage of the programmes; hopefully [it will be possible] in September 2022, [when] they will have taken most of the steps in the implementation, serving as a test to know which recommendations have been incorporated at the programmes”.

---

⁵ Selection of articles:
- Eldiario.es Cantabria, April 13, 2021, Besaya delibera en Europa’ busca un jurado ciudadano de 35 personas que definirán el uso de los fondos europeos
- Diario Montañés, April 13, 2021, Besaya delibera en Europa’ busca un jurado ciudadano de 35 personas
- El Faradio, April 24, 2021, Suances abre un proceso participativo para avanzar en el proyecto ‘Besaya delibera en Europa’
- IF Noticias, July 3, 2021, Las propuestas finales de 'Besaya Delibera en Europa' se darán a conocer este mes
- C7, Cantabria televisión, 01 oct. 2021, ‘Besaya Delibera en Europa’ posiciona a Cantabria como referente internacional en participación ciudadana
5. Evaluation by members and researchers

5.1. Self-reporting by jury members

At the end of each Saturday session, an online zoom survey was sent to the Jury to evaluate different aspects of the process and to have a chance to react to it. The survey included the following questions (with the possibility to answer "Yes", "No", "Sometimes", "I don’t know"): 

- Did you feel comfortable in the group? Is the starting information clear and sufficient?
- Have you had any difficulties using the computer?
- Have you been able to express all your opinions, concerns, ideas, etc.?
- Do the minutes of the session reflect well the debates, proposals and/or agreements reached?

The facilitators used the results to adapt the content of the process, although the results of the survey were in general very positive.

For the final pictures, we asked the Jury to define the process in one word. They used the following one:

Hope (4), Future (3), Interesting (3), Progress (2), Commitment, Satisfactory, Expectations, Timely, Together project, Good, Positive, Curious, Transformation, Important, Concord, Useful, Conform, Money, Participate!

---

8 Esperanza (4), Futuro (3), Interesante (3), Progreso (2), Compromiso, Satisfactorio, Expectativas, Oportuno, Juntos proyecto, Bueno, Positivo, Curioso, Transformación, Importante, Concordia, Útil, Conforme, Money, Participa!!
5.2. Evaluation by researchers

Ernesto Ganuza, researcher at CSIC (Spanish National Research Council), has distributed, at the end of the process, a survey to the Jury’s members. It has been completed by 22 participants (from 29).

As a general finding, 70% of people who took part in the citizens’ jury (CJ) consider that citizens are prepared to make recommendations on public spending (both women and men who attended the CJ). Only 10% considered that they were not.

About the different aspects of the process:
- Methodology
The majority (90%) think that the facilitators did a very positive job.

○ The majority thought that people were tolerant of each other's views and opinions.

○ Half of the CJ members thought that the information provided by the experts was helpful to clarify the issues they were working on. Only 10% were doubtful in this respect.

○ Half of the participants thought that the CJ facilitated their ability to have public interest in mind (22% very much and 28% slightly). This view was rejected by 18% of them.

○ The vast majority (90%) think that the CJ is a good methodology to elicit substantial arguments about public policy issues.

- Effect of deliberations on the results

○ 20% thought that the deliberations that took place at the CJ had no significant effect on the results. In contrast, around 40% thought that the debate held at the CJ had some effect on the results. While more than 36% thought that the debate had a very significant effect on the results of the deliberative process.

○ For example, almost a third (28%) said it had significantly changed their original views, while 22% changed them slightly. Only less than 20% felt that the debate had no effect on their views.

- Usefulness of the CJs. All to a greater or lesser extent affirmed the usefulness of the CJ in facilitating citizens' involvement in public affairs (90% considered it very useful for this purpose).

6. Organiser self-evaluation and reflection

6.1. General overview

We consider that the overall process in producing the recommendations has been a success in terms of implication of the political and technical staff directly linked to the process, of the members of the Jury and in terms of quality of recommendations. The question asked was complex, the political situation was not simple, and the COVID context complicated the participation process. However, the feeling is that all the parties implied are satisfied with the process: in spite of the difficulties, the Jury has expressed its satisfaction with the obtained result, with the process in general and with the facilitation in particular. The government has also expressed its satisfaction with the quality of the recommendations and with the development of the process in general. The facilitators are very positive, and have underlined the great learning curve of the Jury and of themselves from the beginning of the process until the end. From Deliberativa, as co-designers of the process, we are happy with the work done, with the final results and with the support of the OECD along the process.

About the impact of the recommendations, as commented above, the government so far has not produced a formal written response to the recommendations. It should happen later in the year.

In order to learn for further processes, we would like to underline some of the areas for improvement and difficulties we have faced, and the main achievements we feel we accomplished.
6.2. Areas for improvement

The main weakness of the project is certainly its lack of support from political parties other than the Socialist party, and especially from its government partner, PRC (regionalist party). Some meetings were organised with PRC representatives, but the feeling is that it was not a full support and implication in the process. The other political parties were also implicated in a very marginal way. As a consequence, the Monitoring committee was diverse, but not enough.

Other weaknesses:
- As previously mentioned, the response rate to the civic lottery was low (3%), and we had difficulties in recruiting specific profiles.
- Having started with speakers chosen by the group of experts; we did it because the time between two sessions was very short (one week) but it would have been interesting to see how it would have gone if we would have started with speakers chosen by the Jury.
- Another weakness is a lack of communication with the broader society. Although the call for projects, before the Jury, led to the gathering of 58 proposals, which was very good, the media coverage and social media response was quite low. We know it is often difficult to get a lot of media and public attention when communicating about representative deliberative processes. In this case, it was even more difficult because of the lack of communication resources.

6.3. Difficulties

The main difficulties have come from:
- The lack of staff in the government.
- The heaviness of administrative procedures, in particular to contract the different service providers, and to find a solution to remunerate the members of the Jury (interesting to note that the final solution was that they needed to be paid so the government would simply do it without trying to fit in an existing scheme). The hiring of service providers delayed the whole process and was also one of the reasons for doing the 12 sessions almost in a row. The contracting rules also obliged, with the time we had, to issue contracts for small amounts (less than 15.000 euros), which was very economically disadvantageous in particular for the facilitators.

Other difficulties:
- Time spent to define the initial task/question for the Jury. It took several months to define the remit.
- The scope of the remit: the issue addressed in the remit was not a dilemma in an obvious way, although it dealt with an important topic, for the government and for the community.
- Decidim online platform: when commissioning a basic Decidim installation service, it is not so simple after to tune the website to meet the needs and make it user friendly. Quite a lot of energy was spent on this matter.
6.4. Achievements

- Jury’s motivation: the members of the Jury were very motivated and stuck to the process in spite of the difficulties. A fundamental contribution to it has been the person in the Government in charge of the relation with the Jury, who was very kind, empathic, and very responsible in her work, and of course the work done by the facilitators.
- Online sessions: although it was complicated at the beginning, the online sessions went well, certainly due to the very good work done in that sense by the facilitators. The solution of hosting the ten people who did not have access to internet and digital infrastructure at home in an Academy was found by the government after a lot of discussions and attempts, and worked very well. Still, the in-person meetings were very much appreciated by the participants.
- General process design. We feel that the general process design worked, fitting together very different pieces (proposals and analysis from the previous group of experts, local projects received through the call for project, inputs from speakers during the sessions, three dimensions of the initial question - European funds, ecological transition, employment etc.).
7. Annexes

7.1. Location, demography and political color

The 10 municipalities involved in the process do not exactly correspond to the Besaya basin. Among these municipalities, Torrelavega stands out, with half of the population of the region living in the city. On the map we can visualize the situation of the municipalities, their population and their political color (the colored dots denote the parties that are part of or that support the government; blue: PP; red: PSOE; dark green: EQUO; light green: PRC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the municipality</th>
<th>Parties in the government</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Population with respect to the total</th>
<th>Map code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cartes</td>
<td>PSOE</td>
<td>5,731</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Corrales de Buelna</td>
<td>PRC-PP</td>
<td>10,767</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miengo</td>
<td>PRC-PSOE-EQUO</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polanco</td>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reocín</td>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>8,399</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santillana del Mar</td>
<td>PSOE-PRC</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suances</td>
<td>PSOE</td>
<td>8,827</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrelavega</td>
<td>PRC-PSOE</td>
<td>51,597</td>
<td>49.07%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfoz de Lloredo (Cuenca del Saja)</td>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Felices de Buelna</td>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>105,144</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, the political color of these is related to the Cantabrian government, except for the government of the small municipality of Los Corrales de Buelna which is supported by the PP and the municipality of Alfoz de Lloredo governed by a mayor who left the PP and presented himself as an independent candidate. It gives the feeling that there could be majority support for this initiative promoted by the Cantabrian government on the part of the municipalities.
7.2. Rules of the Jury

The Jury was organized in accordance with the following rules (published in the website).

1. **Impact**: Recommendations that have the support of a large majority will be presented for implementation. The government of Cantabria agrees to respond publicly to the Jury’s recommendations one month after the recommendations are made, as well as to do a public follow-ups six months and then one year later.

2. **Transparency**: all presentations during the learning phase are recorded and uploaded to the website https://besayaeuropa.es/. All material presented to the Jury is made public after it is presented to the Jury. Once the Jury is finished, a report is published with the details of the methodology used to organize it. The responses given by the public authority to the Jury’s recommendations are published.

3. **Visibility**: the Jury is announced publicly before it starts. Information is provided on how society as a whole can participate and follow the Jury.

4. **Random selection of the members of the Jury**: the random selection is carried out in two stages: the first consists of inviting randomly selected residents to participate, and the second is drawing a descriptive sample from the people who have volunteered to make up the final group of participants, including substitutes. All residents of the 10 participating municipalities have the same opportunities to be selected as members of the Jury.

5. **Demographic descriptiveness of the Jury**: the composition of the Jury must broadly reflect the demographic profile of the 10 municipalities mentioned above. The goal is to create a microcosm of the area. The size of the group allows for a wide diversity of opinions to be included. All members of the Jury receive financial compensation.

6. **Inclusion of all interested parties in the Jury**: any organization, state or local government, informal group or institution whose scope of work and experience is related to the subject of the Jury has the right to present their opinion to the members of the Jury. The role of the Coordinating Team consists solely of verifying whether the Stakeholders meet the criteria established in the Regulations, in which case they are automatically accepted. In the case of this Jury, a space was set up on the website https://besayaeuropa.es/ to be able to collect these proposals. Due to limited time and a potentially large number of Stakeholders, a method of electing their representatives (by Stakeholders themselves) can be used. In this case, the diversity of perspectives must be taken into account.

7. **Information** - the widest possible range of perspectives (opinions) is included in the Jury’s learning phase - if there are diverse solutions and perspectives on a topic, ideally all of them will be presented during the Jury’s learning phase (by experts and/or affected people). A method of combining perspectives may be applied due to time constraints or other practical considerations. The evidence and knowledge presented is accurate, relevant and accessible. Presentations can take the form of a video, audio, written note, or other medium. The members of the Jury may decide to invite other experts and/or affected persons.

8. **Group deliberation**: deliberation takes place during the process and involves: active and attentive listening, weighing and considering multiple perspectives, giving each participant the same opportunity to speak. The program should alternate discussions and activities in small groups and plenary meetings. Qualified facilitation is guaranteed.
9. **Time**: Due to the complexity of most policy issues, deliberation requires adequate time for participants to learn, weigh evidence, and develop informed recommendations.

10. **Integrity**: The Coordinating Team has independence to direct the Jury. The Coordinating Team has the last word in regard to the decisions of the process, in accordance with these Jury Rules.

11. **Opening**: Everyone can make contributions to the Jury in the form of comments, proposals or suggestions in writing.

12. **Fun**: The process is designed in a way that allows a pleasant experience for all its participants.

*The rules of the Jury are based on the *OECD Good Practice Principles for Deliberative Processes for Public Decision Making* and a set of standards developed by the Center for Climate Assemblies.*

### 7.3. Phases of the process

**February 2020**: Call for pilot actions on citizen participation in the application of European cohesion policy promoted by the Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy of the European Commission.

**July 2020**: The proposal of the Government of Cantabria, focused on the transition towards a green economy with low carbon emissions, is selected by the European Commission.

**October 2020**: The participatory process focuses on the Besaya area, involving 10 municipalities respecting the urban-rural distribution and the economic link between them.

**December 2020**: Agreement on the phases, and selection of demographic criteria of the Citizens’ Jury.

**February 2021**: Setting the question and the remit of the Citizens’ Jury: *How to take advantage of European green funds in the Besaya basin to create and maintain jobs that respect the criteria of a fair and inclusive ecological transition?*

**March 2021**:

- Presentation of the process to stakeholders in two online meetings.
- Implementing random selection of 7,002 addresses in the selected municipalities of Besaya to choose the participants for the Citizen Jury.

**April 2021**:

- Press Conference (April 13),
- Registration of people interested in participating.
- Call for projects on the website.
- Selection of the 35 participants through a descriptive demographic stratification.

**May - July 2021**:

- Virtual implementation of the 12 sessions of the Citizens’ jury.
• Delivery of the report of recommendations to the Minister of Economy and Finance of the Government of Cantabria.

**September 2021, February 2022 and September 2022:** Public responses from the Government of Cantabria to the conclusions of the Citizens’ Jury.

### 7.4. Details of Civic lottery

**How were the addresses selected?**

A total of 44,795 addresses distributed among the ten municipalities involved in the civic lottery were likely to be selected among the 7,002 letters that have been sent to invite residents to participate in the Besaya Citizen Jury. The random selection was developed by the General Directorate of European Funds in collaboration with the Cantabrian Institute of Statistics.

The objective was to select approximately 7,000 addresses at random, with the sole condition of respecting the proportion between the letters sent and the population of each of the ten municipalities. In this way, a Microsoft Excel document was prepared which contained, divided into ten tabs, all the valid addresses, that is, those in which at least one person is registered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUNICIPIOS</th>
<th>POBLACIÓN</th>
<th>DIRECCIONES VÁLIDAS</th>
<th>CARTAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALFOZ DE LLOREDO</td>
<td>2.394</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTES</td>
<td>5.731</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRALES DE BUELNA</td>
<td>10.767</td>
<td>4.651</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIENGO</td>
<td>4.891</td>
<td>2.211</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLANCO</td>
<td>5.942</td>
<td>2.413</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REOCÍN</td>
<td>8.399</td>
<td>3.253</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FELICES DE BUELNA</td>
<td>2.367</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTILLANA</td>
<td>4.229</td>
<td>1.757</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUANCES</td>
<td>8.827</td>
<td>3.581</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORRELAVEGA</td>
<td>51.597</td>
<td>22.647</td>
<td>3.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>105.144</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.795</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.002</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taking into account the technical procedures, the Cantabrian Government’s Computing and Data Band Service created an application to extract, as many times as necessary, a list of ‘n’ random integers in the range ‘1… N’, where ‘n’ is the sample size and ‘N’, the size of the population from which the sample is drawn.

Following the requirements, the SIDB generated a javascript hosted in [https://random-number-icane.netlify.app/](https://random-number-icane.netlify.app/), whose source code is accessible from the following repository [https://github.com/icane/random-numbers](https://github.com/icane/random-numbers).

Once the application was developed, the sortition followed the following sequence:

1. Ten Excel books were extracted from the application, each one with the number of random numbers as letters to be sent to each municipality, including the number of valid addresses as a population parameter of each municipality.
2. The sheet with the valid addresses of each municipality and a blank sheet called ‘result’ were attached to these books.
3. Each of these books was automatically crossed (as shown in the following Macro) with the list of valid addresses for each municipality, filling in this third sheet exclusively with the valid addresses whose row number coincided with the random numbers generated for all municipalities.
4. Finally, all the records from the result sheets of the ten books were copied into a new book that contains the 7,002 valid addresses selected at random, and that was delivered as a result of the lottery.

```vba
Sub Extracción()
    ' Extracción Macro
    ' Extrae las direcciones seleccionadas en la hoja “Resultado”
    Dim fila_sorteo, fila_direccion, ultima_filasorteo, fila_pagado As Integer
    ’ Inicialización de variables
    fila_direccion = 1
    fila_pagado = 0
    Sheets("Hoja10000_sortearos").Select
    ActiveCell.SpecialCells(xlLastCell).Select
    ultima_filasorteo = ActiveCell.Row ’ Se obtiene el total de filas sorteadas
    Range("A1").Select
    For fila_sorteo = 2 To ultima_filasorteo + 1 ’ Regite el proceso de copiado y pegado tantas veces como filas se han sorteado
        Sheets("Prueba Sorteo").Select
        fila_direccion = ActiveCell ’ Recoge el valor de cada número sorteado
        Cells(fila_direccion, 1).Select ’ Avanza en los números sorteados
        Cells("DIRECCIONES_ultima_30000").Select
        Rows(fila_direccion & ":1" & fila_direccion).Select
        Selection.Copy ’ Copia la fila seleccionada al portapeles
        Sheets("Resultado").Select
        fila_pagado = fila_pagado + 1 ’ Define la fila de la hoja de destino en la que pegar la dirección seleccionada
        Cells(fila_pagado, 1).Select
        ActiveSheet.Paste ’ Pega la dirección sorteada en la página de resultado
    Next
End Sub
```

**How were the 35 members chosen?**

On May 3, 2021, the registration period for participants terminated and it was time to select, from among all the interested people who had received the 7,002 invitation letters, the 35 chosen to compose this Citizen...
Jury of the Besaya. For this, a stratified selection process has been followed based on predetermined conditions.

The indications given by the consulting organization hired by the OECD (Delibrativa), led to the inclusion of the following biases:

- Sex
- Age
- Level of education
- Municipality of residence
- Question about values

It was also wanted to give voice, indirectly, to those under sixteen years of age, that they could not enroll in the project, so the participants were asked if there was a minor of that age and their family structure living in their home.

The Cantabrian Institute of Statistics (ICANE) provided the necessary demographic data to know the distribution of the first four factors and the structure of the households in the target municipalities, for the last section the participants had to express their degree of agreement with various statements and they compared the responses with surveys previously conducted in the territory.

The tool used for stratification is called StratifySelect_v3-4, software developed by the Sortition Foundation Citizens'Assembly (https://www.sortitionfoundation.org/), a non-profit entity that was contracted to the process and that is specialized in these developments.

Once the stratification of the registered participants was executed based on the characteristics defined above, the 35 people who will initially make up the Citizen Jury were extracted.

The last part of the selection process consisted of verifying that the chosen people met the participation requirements and that they were in a position to do so. Possible casualties on the jury would be replaced following the same criteria.

### 7.5. Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>OECD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.000,00 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratification of Civic lottery</td>
<td>1.500,00 €</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ remuneration</td>
<td>15.540,00 €</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>12.670,32 €</td>
<td>7.391,40 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts and speakers</td>
<td>5.670,00 €</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital platform</td>
<td>3.946,00 €</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator for digital platform</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.300,00 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic design + video editing</td>
<td>9.500,00 €</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48.826,32 €</td>
<td>39.691,40 €</td>
<td>88.517,72 €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This budget does not include all the work done internally by the government and the hiring of the Academy for non digitized participants. It is a minimum budget, appropriate to a first pilot process. Some expenses would need to be increased in the future, in particular the costs related to facilitation, as these were underbudgeted.