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CATCHING THE DELIBERATIVE WAVE

Chapter 2 figures

Models of representative deliberative processes

Source: all figures and tables are author’s own creation based on data in the OECD Database of Representative Deliberative Processes and Institutions (2020).
### TABLE 2.1. MODELS OF REPRESENTATIVE DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informed citizen recommendations on policy questions</th>
<th>Average no. of participants per panel</th>
<th>Average length of meetings</th>
<th>Average length from first to last meeting</th>
<th>No. of times used to date process (panels)</th>
<th>Used by countries</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Policy questions Addressed to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Citizens’ Assembly</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.8 days</td>
<td>47 weeks</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>Canada, Ireland</td>
<td>Detailed collective recommendations</td>
<td>Electoral reforms, institutional setup, constitutional questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Citizens’ Jury/Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collective recommendations</td>
<td>Broad range of topics. Most common: infrastructure, health, urban planning, environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Consecutive day meetings</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.1 days</td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
<td>115 (168)</td>
<td>Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Poland, Spain, UK, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Non-consecutive day meetings</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.4 days</td>
<td>0 weeks</td>
<td>23 (40)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Ongoing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.1 days</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
<td>90 (126)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consensus Conference</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0 days</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>19 (19)</td>
<td>Australia, Austria, Denmark, France, Norway, United Kingdom</td>
<td>Collective recommendations</td>
<td>New technology, environment, health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Planning Cell</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.2 days</td>
<td>0 weeks</td>
<td>57 (247)</td>
<td>Germany, Japan</td>
<td>Collective position report / citizens’ report</td>
<td>Most common use for urban planning, but also other topics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Citizen opinion on policy questions

| 5. G1000                                            | 346                                  | 1.7 days                  | 4 weeks                                   | 12 (12)                                   | The Netherlands, Spain | Votes on proposals | Strategic planning: developing a future vision for the city |
| 6. Citizens’ Council                                | 15                                   | 1.7 days                  | 1 week                                    | 14 (24)                                   | Austria, Germany      | Collective recommendations | Various topics, most common: environment, strategic planning |
| 7. Citizens’ Dialogues                              | 148                                  | 2.1 days                  | 4 weeks                                   | 38 (112)                                  | Globally             | Broad ideas / recommendations | Various topics, often several addressed at once |
| 8. Deliberative Poll/Survey                        | 226                                  | 1.6 days                  | 0 weeks                                   | 14 (15)                                   | Argentina, Australia, Brazil, China, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mongolia, USA | Survey opinions and opinion changes | Various topics |
| 9. WWViews                                         | 120                                  | 1 day                     | 0 weeks                                   | 4 (150)                                   | Globally             | Votes on proposals | Environment issues on a global scale |

### Informed citizen evaluation of ballot measures

| 10. Citizens’ Initiative Review                     | 22                                   | 4.4 days                  | 0 weeks                                   | 8 (8)                                     | USA                 | Collective statement of key facts | Various topics |

### Permanent deliberative bodies

| 11. Ostbelgien model                                | 24                                   | No data yet               | 1.5 years                                 | 1 (1)                                     | Belgium             | Collective recommendations | Mandate to set the agenda and initiate citizens’ panels |
| 12. City Observatory                                | 49                                   | 8 days                    | 1 year                                    | 1 (1)                                     | Spain               | Decisions on citizen proposals | Mandate to evaluate citizen proposals and suggest them for referenda |

Note: All calculations for this table have been made by the authors on the basis of the data from the 289 cases, which together feature 763 separate deliberative panels, collected for this study, from OECD Member and non-Member countries. The average length from first to last meeting of the Planning Cell is an exception due to lack of data. In this instance, Nexus Institute, the principal organisation implementing Planning Cells in Germany, was consulted. The overall average length of meetings of the Citizens’ Jury/Panel excludes the ongoing processes.

Source: OECD Database of Representative Deliberative Processes and Institutions (2020)
FIGURE 2.1. TYPES OF PURPOSE OF REPRESENTATIVE DELIBERATIVE PROCESSES
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FIGURE 2.2. CITIZENS’ ASSEMBLY MODEL

Face-to-face meetings for 18.8 days over 47 weeks (on average)

Learning:
- Introductory readings
- Learning sessions
- Stakeholder hearings
- Hearings of the public

Consultation:
- Discussing evidence
- Assessing options
- Impartial facilitators

Deliberation:
- Agreeing on the final recommendations

Decision making:
- Detailed collective recommendations

Local / regional / national government

Public Communication:
- Full information available about the deliberative process, participant selection
- Learning materials available online
- Stakeholder presentations available online
- Online streaming of deliberation
- Press conference to present recommendations
- Full recommendations report available
- Public government response to recommendations

Various methods of citizen participation in parallel (surveys, public consultations, roundtables)

FIGURE 2.4. CITIZENS’ JURY/PANEL MODEL

Face-to-face meetings for 4.1 days over 5 weeks (on average)

For ongoing processes: face-to-face meetings for 11 days over 2 years

Learning:
- Introductory readings
- Learning sessions

Consultation:
- Stakeholder hearings
- Hearings of the public

Deliberation:
- Discussing evidence
- Assessing options
- Impartial facilitators

Decision making:
- Agreeing on the final recommendations

Collective recommendations

Local / regional / national government

Various methods of citizen engagement (surveys, public consultations, roundtables)
**FIGURE 2.7. CONSENSUS CONFERENCE MODEL**

Face-to-face meetings for 4 days over 2 weeks on average

- Preparatory weekend
- Consensus conference

- Learning
  - Group work
  - Plenary sessions
  - Questions prepared by citizens

- Expert panel
  - Experts present
  - Citizens can choose experts presenting
  - Citizens pose questions
  - Deliberation starts

- Deliberation
  - Deliberation producing recommendations
  - Consensus to be reached

- Presenting report
  - Citizens present
  - Experts react
  - Politicians debate
  - Press and audience is present

Panel’s Report (Consensus reached)

Local / regional / national government

- Random selection of 16 citizens on average

**FIGURE 2.9. PLANNING CELL MODEL**

Face-to-face meetings for 3.2 consecutive days on average

- Learning
  - 1.5h information sessions on subtopics

- Deliberation
  - In small groups
  - No moderation
  - Results presented & discussed by all

- Agreeing on the results

- Citizens’ Report

- Cell 2

- Cell 3

Local government

- Random selection of 24 citizens on average

**FIGURE 2.11. G1000 MODEL**

- Random selection of 750 citizens (75% of all participants)
  - Plus 25% of appointed civil servants, politicians & employers

- Citizens’ Summit
  - Setting the agenda
  - Identifying issues
  - Deliberation over potential solutions

- 1 day

- Citizens’ Forum
  - 40% of all participants gather
  - Elaborating ideas
  - Making concrete proposals

- 4 evenings

- Citizens’ Assembly
  - All participants gather
  - Deliberating over final proposals
  - Voting on proposals

- 1 day

- Local government

- Votes on proposals

- Monitoring committee established
  - Composed of citizen volunteers

- Monitors implementation of proposals
FIGURE 2.13. CITIZENS’ COUNCIL MODEL

Stage 1
- Identifying topics of public interest

Stage 2
- Developing solutions via dynamic facilitation

Collective recommendations

Local / regional / national government

Face-to-face meetings for 1.7 consecutive days on average

Random selection of 15 citizens on average

FIGURE 2.15. CITIZENS’ DIALOGUE MODEL

- Learning and debating over policy issues
- Listening to expert panels
- Discussing with politicians

Local / regional / national government

Citizens’ ideas or feedback statement

Face-to-face meetings for 2.1 days over 4 weeks on average

Random selection of 148 citizens on average

FIGURE 2.18. DELIBERATIVE POLL/SURVEY MODEL

Learning and deliberation
- Debates in small groups with moderators
- Plenary sessions where citizens pose questions to experts & policy makers

Opinion Poll of participants

Analysis of opinion changes

Face-to-face meetings for 1.6 consecutive days on average

Opinion Poll of a random sample of citizens

Random selection of 226 citizens on average (from those who were polled)
Random selection of 120 citizens (per panel) on average

National governments and international organisations

Combined voting results

For each topic:
- Groups of 5-8
- Video introduction
- Deliberation
- Vote

Country 2

Country 70

FIGURE 2.20. WORLD WIDE VIEWS MODEL

Face-to-face meetings for 1 full day on average

Random selection of 22 citizens on average

Voters’ Pamphlet

Collective statement of key facts

Training programme
- Fundamentals of deliberation and evaluating information

Learning and evaluation
- Q&A with pro/con campaigns and with independent experts
- Assessing information for costs and benefits

Editing and Refining Information
- Discussing and drafting evidence statements

Drafting Pro/Con Statements
- Prioritising and explaining evidence
Drafting rationales for voting for / against the initiative

FIGURE 2.21. CITIZENS’ INITIATIVE REVIEW MODEL

Face-to-face meetings for 4.4 consecutive days on average
Random selection of 24 citizens
- Agenda-setting
- Initiating Citizens' Panels
- Monitoring implementation

Face-to-face meetings over 1.5 year period

Citizens' Council
- 25-50 people
- Min. 3 meetings over 3 months

Collective recommendations

Regional parliament

Min. 2 parliamentary debates about recommendations

Citizens' Panel

FIGURE 2.23. OSTBELGIEN MODEL

Random selection of 49 citizens on average
- Deliberate over citizen proposals submitted online
- Propose their own suggestions and ideas

Decisions on citizen proposals

Local government

Proposals

Results of the referendum

Local referendum

8 full-day face-to-face meetings over 1 year period

FIGURE 2.25. CITY OBSERVATORY MODEL
### FIGURE 2.27. PROPERTIES OF REPRESENTATIVE DELIBERATIVE MODELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity of the policy question</th>
<th>Depth of recommendations</th>
<th>Flexibility given to participants</th>
<th>Resources necessary</th>
<th>Length of the process</th>
<th>Level of government for which used so far</th>
<th>So far used as permanent or ad hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Broad</td>
<td>Partially experienced</td>
<td>Low-cost</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Local, Regional, National, International</td>
<td>Ad hoc or Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Informed citizen recommendations on policy questions

- **Citizens’ Assembly**: Simple, Broad, Partially experienced, Low-cost, Short, Local, Regional, National, International
- **Citizens’ Jury/Panel**: Simple, Broad, Partially experienced, Low-cost, Short, Local, Regional, National, International
- **Consensus Conference**: Simple, Broad, Partially experienced, Low-cost, Short, Local, Regional, National, International
- **Planning Cell**: Simple, Broad, Partially experienced, Low-cost, Short, Local, Regional, National, International

#### Citizen opinion on policy questions

- **G1000**: Simple, Broad, Partially experienced, Low-cost, Short, Local, Regional, National, International
- **Citizens’ Council**: Simple, Broad, Partially experienced, Low-cost, Short, Local, Regional, National, International
- **Citizens’ Dialogues**: Simple, Broad, Partially experienced, Low-cost, Short, Local, Regional, National, International
- **Deliberative Poll/Survey**: Simple, Broad, Partially experienced, Low-cost, Short, Local, Regional, National, International
- **World Wide Views**: Simple, Broad, Partially experienced, Low-cost, Short, Local, Regional, National, International

#### Informed citizen evaluation of ballot measures

- **Citizens’ Initiative Review**: Complex, Broad, Partially experienced, Low-cost, Short, Local, Regional, National, International

#### Permanent deliberative bodies

- **The Oostbelgian Model**: Complexity, Depth of recommendations, Flexibility given to participants, Resources necessary, Length of the process, Level of government for which used so far, So far used as permanent or ad hoc
- **City Observatory**: Complexity, Depth of recommendations, Flexibility given to participants, Resources necessary, Length of the process, Level of government for which used so far, So far used as permanent or ad hoc