UNIVERSITY OF
TECHNOLOGY SYDNEY

INSTITUTE FOR SUSTAINABLE FUTURES

STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS OF DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACTIC PROCESSES

Institute for
Sustainable
Futures

2015

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

The Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF) was established by the University of Technology, Sydney in 1996 to work with industry, government and the community to develop sustainable futures through research and consultancy. Our mission is to create change toward sustainable futures that protect and enhance the environment, human well-being and social equity. We seek to adopt an inter-disciplinary approach to our work and engage our partner organisations in a collaborative process that emphasises strategic decision-making.

For further information visit: **www.isf.uts.edu.au**

Research team: Jade Herriman, Aleta Lederwasch, Chris Riedy

CITATION

Cite this report as:

Lederwasch, Aleta, Herriman, Jade and Riedy, Chris (2015). Stakeholder Perceptions of Deliberative Democractic Processes. A report for newDemocracy Foundation. November 2014.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thank you to the 10 individuals who participated in interviews for this research, and to Nivek Thompson and Iain Walker from newDemocracy Foundation for their support, inputs and review.

REVIEW

Version	Author	Reviewed by	Date
0.1	AL	JH	30-06-14
1.0	AL	JH	18-07-14
1.1	AL & JH	JH	04-08-14
2.0	AL & JH	CR	14-08-14
2.1	AL, JH, and CR	JH	20-08-14
2.2	AL, JH, and CR	NT (at nDF)	01-10-14
3.0	AL, JH, and CR	CR	14-11-14
4.0	AL, JH and CR	NT (at nDF)	21-05-15

UTS:INSTITUTE FOR SUSTAINABLE FUTURES

21 MAY 2015

Stakeholder Perceptions of Deliberative Democratic processes

Prepared for: newDemocracy Foundation

AUTHORS

Aleta Lederwasch

Jade Herriman

Chris Riedy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF TABLES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The newDemocracy Foundation conducted a Citizens' Policy Jury on the issue of safe and vibrant nightlife in Sydney. The Jury is an example of a deliberative democracy approach that gives citizens a chance to participate directly in decision-making about policy issues. The Foundation engaged the Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF) at the University of Technology Sydney to explore stakeholder perceptions of the Jury process through interviews with key stakeholders.

Interviews were conducted with representatives from 10 different stakeholder groups with a specific interest in the issues considered by the Jury, and/or with a specific interest in the business or communities in the local areas affected by the issues considered by the Jury. The groups included in the research were public interest advocates, support groups, commercial organisations, government organisations, and professional organisations / experts.

All interviewees expressed a **strong interest in the issue of a vibrant and safe nightlife.** Eight interviewees reported previous participation in the issue, which included making submissions on related policy previous to the Citizens' Policy Jury.   All interviewees were **aware that the Jury had occurred** but the level of awareness of key components of the process and the level of understanding of what these key components involved varied significantly.

Understanding and involvement

- Half of the groups interviewed had a **limited understanding of the process but had a general appreciation** that 'it was setting out to find out what the public were thinking' and most of these people were interested to learn more. The other half of the interviewees felt they had, and demonstrated, a **good to thorough understanding of the process**, including the purpose of it, recruitment process, submission process and the selection and involvement of speakers. One interviewee described it as a 'model to democratise decision making and provide a representative slice of the population to deliberate on complex and challenging policy areas'.

- Half the interviewees expressed that they were **satisfied with their level and nature of involvement**. The level of satisfaction ranged from expectations being met to be being very happy. Others variously felt that they would have liked to be kept more informed about the plans for the Jury, given more time to speak or had greater use made of (or feedback on) their submission.

Perceptions of diversity and representativeness

- In terms of participant recruitment, seven interviewees felt the process was **fair and had resulted in a diverse and representative group of jurors**, saying for

example 'the jury selection process was a pretty solid one in terms of diversity. I don't think you can question the fairness of this process.'

- Four were concerned that either residents outside of the local area had been involved, or that local voices were not as prominent as they could have been due to the mix of participants. Four groups were specifically concerned that the process **potentially 'left out' local voices** – of residents or residents groups, for example saying: 'I think it does leave out representatives of community groups who have depth of knowledge that can help inform the recommendations'.

Views on the process

- Those interviewees who were aware of the **submission process** were broadly satisfied with it, with two highlighting the benefits in anyone being able to make a submission, including voices not usually heard on the topic at hand. Three raised questions about how widely known the process was, or whether the branding of nDF is strong enough to attract a wide range of submissions. Those who weren't satisfied with the submission process linked it to past processes of submission making which had been unsatisfactory.

- Half the interviewees were satisfied with the process of **selecting speakers** to address the jury. Three of these particularly valued that the jury could invite whomever they wanted to hear from and felt that the selection of speakers was 'a good **representative cross section of the different views within the sector'**.

- Four interviewees who were generally happy with the process for selecting speakers nonetheless had suggestions for particular organisations or perspectives they would have liked to see represented.

- Two interviewees were **sceptical of the process in which speakers** were selected. One felt that the average person wouldn't be able to choose speakers relevant to the topic and the other was 'highly sceptical' due to the fact that a particular industry organisation had been invited to speak.

Satisfaction with the recommendations

- Half the interviewees were relatively **satisfied to very happy with the recommendations**. Three interviewees felt they could not comment, as they did not have a great awareness of the recommendations. A couple were critical of them. Seven of the interviewees expressed a willingness to accept the recommendations. However, amongst these interviewees most expressed this willingness on a conditional basis.

- Two interviewees, who were happy with the recommendations and willing to accept them, specified a need to do more work on them to enable **implementation**.

- No one was strongly opposed to **accepting** them however three expressed some reservation. In all cases the reservation seemed to be related to either scepticism

about the process or a general distrust in government, as opposed to a lack of trust in the capacity of the jury to make valuable recommendations.

Value of these processes for decision-making

- Eight interviewees saw **value in the use of this type of process by governments** in different contexts in future. They felt that this approach to engagement in decision making was useful and **potentially applicable for a range of policy issues**: 'very valuable…would love to see this used for other things'. In contrast, a few interviewees felt that it offers value as a future community engagement process so long as it is used alongside other forms of stakeholder engagement: 'if this works with other things [forms of stakeholder engagement] it is to be welcomed'. Only two interviewees felt there was **little value in the process** and in both cases this seemed strongly related to distrust in government generally.

- Half of the interviewees compared this process favourably to **other forms of community engagement**. Reasons included less bias than other processes, giving citizen voices legitimacy, the length of time given to decision making by the citizens involved, getting to see 'both sides of the story', and giving State government a chance to 'sit aside from its own ideas and listen to the community'.

- Four of those who didn't rate it favourably compared to other forms of engagement **felt fairly neutral about the CPJ when comparing it to other forms of community engagement.** In some cases this seemed to be due to a lack of understanding of what the CPJ involved compared to other engagement processes. Other reasons included cynicism about what the government does with the outputs and concerns about the lack of opportunities for wider participation (beyond the selected residents)

- Eight interviewees **expressed trust in the process.** A few interviewees reported being optimistic with the process from the start, while others felt that the more they learned the more trust they had in the process. Only two interviewees lacked trust in the process. Those who did not trust the process saw it as being similar to other decision making or engagement processes they have been involved with or witnessed, and had strong views that 'government will only listen to whatever supports their own agenda'.

Views of specific stakeholder groups

- It was difficult to determine a consistent view from each stakeholder group category – where we interviewed multiple organisations of the same stakeholder type, there were variations in their perspectives of the Jury – it's usefulness, it's value as a mechanism for engaging citizens, and in it's recommendations.

- The public interest advocacy groups were critical of the process, for different reasons. The three groups in this category that were interviewed were an

independent national organisation that conducts research and education on alcohol and two community groups that aim to improve the quality of life of communities in their local area. Local groups felt that local voices were under represented in the process, while the national group was not satisfied with the recommendations and felt that the framing of the issue skewed the focus of the final recommendations.

• Two of the three commercial organisations interviewed saw value in this process going forward. One saw it as a valuable tool for government, and one felt that it has potential to be a valuable future tool so long as it is complimented with other forms of stakeholder involvement. The third interviewee in this stakeholder category saw little future value in the process.

Recommendations for future processes

• Providing more information about certain stages of the process, providing follow up information to those briefed on the project or who make submissions, and clarifying the role of partner organisations in promoting the event and seeking submissions could be useful additions to future processes.

• Support for the process appeared to grow as individual's experience and familiarity with the process grew. Finding ways to involve stakeholders in overseeing or designing the process could be valuable.

1 INTRODUCTION

The newDemocracy Foundation conducted a Citizens' Policy Jury on the issue of a safe and vibrant nightlife in Sydney during early 2014. The Jury is an example of a deliberative democracy approach that gives citizens a chance to participate directly in decision-making about policy issues. The Foundation engaged the Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF) at the University of Technology Sydney to explore stakeholder perceptions of the Jury process through interviews with key stakeholders.

This report outlines the findings of that research and makes recommendations for how the feedback of stakeholders might be used to inform design detail of future processes.

1.1 DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES AND STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

Deliberative democratic processes are a type of democratic innovation that seeks to improve public participation in decision-making processes. As it is not practical to directly involve the entire community in a decision-making process, a common deliberative democratic approach is to form a 'mini-public' (Mackenzie and Warren, 2012), made up of a small group of randomly selected citizens. One type of mini-public is a Citizens' Jury, analogous to a legal jury, which brings together citizens to deliberate on a policy issue. Citizens' Juries can be used as an alternative to committees of politicians, and as an alternative to 'standard' community engagement activities which may involve canvassing opinion (polling) or responding to the strongly-held views of vocal stakeholder groups or politically empowered individual citizens.

Deliberative democratic processes are often proposed as a way to get beyond standard binary views of an issue, elicit an informed and empathetic response from participants, and encourage weighing up and trading up of options before arriving at policy recommendations. Deliberative democratic processes are normative approaches for community engagement which provide a space where people can deliberate on complex issues in dialogue with other citizens and in the presence of information about issues. They are:

> *… techniques that facilitate deliberation about issues and common values rather than just soliciting individualistic position or preference statements … allow for discussion among participants and between participants and officials' (Halvorsen 2006: p. 153).*

By involving 'non-aligned' citizens and demonstrating process rigour these processes seek to 'rise above' entrenched views and conflict, and to demonstrate a robust, defensible and therefore trustworthy process to the broader community.

How stakeholder groups, who traditionally have a strong voice in engagement processes, respond to these processes and their role in them is the focus of this research.

Hendriks (2011, p179) discusses the way that interest advocates 'receive and interpret' attempts to make policy more inclusive and deliberative. She observes that interest advocates (a term which for the purposes of consistency we will take to be interchangeable with the term stakeholders) respond differently in different cases – ranging from being disengaged and disruptive to the process, to being passively disengaged, being sceptical but engaged, and being actively engaged (p180). There is heterogeneity of response within and across different types of interest advocates (p197). Despite the diversity of responses across cases, public interest organisations were more likely to support citizen's forums than any other category of organisation[1].

The categories of interest advocates (stakeholder organisations) used in Hendriks (2011) were: public interest advocates, support groups, commercial organisations, government organisations, professional organisations and experts. Support groups include groups such as 'patient associations' (p179), whereas 'public interest advocates' includes groups such as 'environmental, consumer and disability groups' (p179). It is important to note that Hendriks (2011) developed this typology on the basis of the primary motivating interest of the group rather than on features such as organisational structure, membership or internal communications.

In Hendriks' research, political context appeared to shape the way that stakeholders participated or chose not to participate – revealing that stakeholders respond strategically in the context of the particular forum, weighing up the political, public relations, communications, resourcing and other costs and benefits of participation (p. 181-90).

1.2 THE CASE STUDY

The following section provides a brief overview of the project that this piece of research and report focuses on. More details are included at Appendix 1 - **Process summary of the Citizen Policy Jury – design and implementation.**

Citizens' Policy Jury on a Vibrant and Safe Sydney Nightlife

In August 2013 the newDemocracy Foundation (nDF) was appointed by the City of Sydney and supported and co-funded by the Premier's office to conduct a Citizens' Policy Jury on the topic of ***"How can we ensure a safe and vibrant nightlife for Sydney?"***. South Australian Parliament, under Premier Jay Weatherill, had previously conducted a Citizen's Policy Jury on the same topic; the NSW process was designed and framed to mirror this. The City of Sydney's role was complemented by the commitment of Premier O'Farrell to table the results of the Jury's deliberations before Parliament, verbatim and unedited – meaning that the project undertaken in SA and the one happening in NSW had equivalent levels of pre-agreed authority[2].

> *The Citizens Jury will operate in a challenging area of policy which the public perceives is subject to activist interest groups, powerful lobbyists and superficial*

---

[1] We discuss these categories further in section 3 of this report; Methodology.
[2] http://www.newdemocracy.com.au/ accessed 15/01/14

media comment: most changes reported as being "tough on crime" or "soft on crime" and fuelling simplistic partisan debate. The project seeks to prove that decision making can be done strikingly differently and in so doing earn much greater public support and generate more innovative solutions.[3] (p1)

The challenge to ensure a healthy, safe and vibrant night-time economy is one of trade-offs that necessarily and by definition affects personal freedoms. Council and Government finds itself in a no-win position of applying "nanny state" laws or "failing to protect our children": adversarialism, lobbying and perceptions of influence on judgment cloud paths of action. (p2)

In selection of the Citizens' Policy Jury, random selection and stratification were used to ensure a mix (matched to Census data) of juror age, gender and location[4]. With respect to location, the organisers sought to include people who live in Sydney, people who work in Sydney and people who visit for entertainment.

There were two stages to the selection process. First, invitations to participate in the Citizens' Policy Jury (CPJ) were extended to a randomly selected sample of 20,000+ citizens taken from the commercially available Australia Post address database. There was also a mail out to a randomly selected group of students from the University of Sydney to ensure sufficient participation from younger people. Invitees were invited to register electronically with nDF to indicate that they were available for the final selection.[5]

Second, from the positive responses, a random sample was drawn electronically based on the pre-agreed stratification goals referred to above. The aim was to achieve a group descriptively representative of the community even if one subset of the community responded disproportionately to the initial invitation. Through this process, 43 jurors were selected to form the Citizens' Policy Jury.

The remit of the Jury was to reach agreement on the question:

How can we ensure we have a vibrant and safe Sydney nightlife?

The Jury was asked for a minimum of five specific reform recommendations.

The CPJ was convened over three months; the jury met in-person five times between February and April 2014 for full day meetings. The Jury's self-written recommendations were published on the nDF's website at the conclusion of the process.

In this particular process (the Citizens' Policy Jury on a Vibrant and Safe Sydney Nightlife) the participating citizens themselves select which (if any) stakeholder voices they wish to hear more of through expert guest speakers and which (if any) written stakeholder submissions they wish to read and consider. This means that beyond writing a submission, the stakeholders may have little direct interface with the Jury. The degree to

---

[3] Proposal for The Lord Mayor of the City of Sydney 'A Safe and Vibrant Nightlife for Sydney' Process Design Overview: Identifying the View of an Informed Public. September 12th 3013.
[4] ibid.
[5] ibid.

which they will have trust in the robustness of the process, satisfaction with their role, and willingness to accept the final recommendations is the focus of this research.

The topic of focus for this CPJ was one of state significance, which was receiving coverage in the media a the time of the Jury, following two high profile deaths resulting from 'alcohol fuelled violence' in the Sydney CBD over the previous 12 months. In parallel to this process, there were calls for 'tough new measures' related to alcohol curfews, mandatory sentencing for alcohol related violence and risk related licensing of venues[6]. In addition to this the state government had made some licensing related decisions 2 days before the CPJ started.

---

[6] http://www.smh.com.au/nsw/premier-pledges-to-take-action-on-alcoholfuelled-violence-20140121-316y0.html

2 RESEARCH AIMS

This research aimed to explore how stakeholders (from organised community groups, industry and government agencies) perceive deliberative democratic events – both the legitimacy of the process, their role in the process and the outcomes. This research addressed this aim through analysis of stakeholder experiences of a NSW case study – the Citizens' Policy Jury on a Vibrant and Safe Sydney Nightlife.

While recognizing that 'stakeholder' is sometimes used to describe an individual with an interest in an issue or decision, we use the term in this report to designate the representative of a formally constituted group or organization that has or is thought to have a collective interest. This corresponds with the definitions as outlined in Kahane, Lopston, Herriman and Hardy (2013).

Specific research aims included, to:

- Identify which stakeholder groups trust or don't trust deliberative democratic processes.
- Gain insight into how key stakeholder groups respond to these types of processes.
- Generate recommendations for how to best approach key stakeholders when engaging them with such processes.
- Provide practical advice that organisers and facilitators of these processes may find useful in increasing levels of trust in these processes, improving outcomes, and supporting stakeholder groups in future processes.
- Identify the strengths of these processes from the perspective of key stakeholders.
- Identify the weaknesses / areas for improvement of these processes from the perspective of key stakeholders.
- Explore whether the level of invested interest in the issue makes a difference to stakeholders perceptions of these processes.

3 **METHODOLOGY**

Interviews were conducted with representatives from 10 different stakeholder groups with a specific interest in the issues considered by the Jury, and/or with a specific interest in the business or communities in the local areas affected by the issues considered by the Jury. The groups included in the research were public interest advocates, support groups, commercial organisations, government organisations, and professional organisations / experts.

3.1 STAKEHOLDER MAPPING & SELECTING ORGANISATIONS TO INTERVIEW

To identify potential interviewees we mapped key stakeholders against Hendricks' stakeholder group categories (Hendricks 2011). These categories are identified in Table 1. Table 1 lists groups that Hendricks gives as examples under each category and other types of groups that we have taken to be included in each of these, in the context of the CPJ on a Vibrant and Safe Sydney Nightlife.

We then applied several filters to arrive at ten interviewees. The number of interviewees was selected as a compromise between resource constraints and ensuring sufficient diversity. The filters **included level of invested interest in the issue of a vibrant and safe nightlife, and the nature of involvement** in the process (in this case whether they were an invited speaker to address the Jury, whether they/their group had made a submission on the issue, whether they attended the mayoral round table that addressed the issue).

From these we generated a 'long list' of potential organisations mapped against these stakeholder groups types. We then selected across the categories to attain 10 organisations who reflected not just each of the stakeholder types, but also a mix of highly involved, and less involved groups. Within this there were several groups who were described as core to the research (the two auspicing government organisations, and the community group who initiated / supported the process).

NewDemocracy Foundation themselves were not one of the 10 interviewees, however an information interview was held with a project officer from nDF during the course of the research, to clarify some of the details of the CPJ process – these are included in **Appendix 1.**

Table 1: Stakeholder groups we approached for interview (T=10)

Stakeholder category	Hendricks' (2011) description	Types of groups we have taken this group to include (sub categories)	Number interviewed
Public interest advocates	Environmental, consumer and disability groups.	• Community groups focussed just on this issue [in this instance alcohol sale, alcohol regulation, safety, the night time economy etc.] • Local community groups focused on neighbourhood issues generally, including this issue	Three (3)
Support groups	Patient associations.	• Community groups focused on young people generally • Community groups who have sponsored the process	One (1)
Commercial organisations	Umbrella groups for large commercial corporations, private insurance groups, research and development entities.	• Industry organisations representing hoteliers and alcohol • Business organisations/alliances • Local businesses with a particular interest in this issue	Three (3)
Government organisations	Ministries, government departments, advisory agencies, public health insurance corporations, state-sponsored research and development organisations.	• Police and correction • Emergency services/medical • Education • Local government sponsors • State government sponsors • Regulators of alcohol	Two (2)
Professional organisations and experts	Geneticists, medical practitioners, biotechnologists, and scientists and consultants who advise governments.	• Urban planners • Medical professionals • Legal and crime professionals • Professionals conducting research in alcohol	One (1)

Developing a long-list and shortlist of groups

We contacted a total of 13 organisations to secure the 10 interviews. The ones we did not secure but tried included one State Government representative, a local business and a particular residents committee. Despite this, all stakeholder categories were represented in the research, and many of the 'sub categories' that we identified in the third column of Table 1 were also represented.

Some comments on selection of groups:

- 'Support groups' was the category that we identified the least number of potential interviewees in the long list stage; we identified 4 (and only held one interview in this category).
- Under the category 'commercial organizations' we had identified 'Local business with an interest in the issue' a potentially useful sub-category. However despite identifying an organization on this type on the long list (a business who had presented to the Jury), they were unable to be interviewed due to other commitments, so instead we focused on Industry organisations representing hoteliers and alcohol and Business organisations/alliances (See table 3).
- There were two categories in which we had a large number of organizations we could have contacted:
  - ○ Government organisations – we identified 4 sub-categories (Police and Corrective services, State gov, Local gov, and Education). We identified a total of 14 potential interviewees within those categories.
  - ○ Professional organisations and experts – we identified 4 sub-categories (Urban Planners, Medical, Legal and Crime and Alcohol). We identified 10 potential interviewees.

For more details of each of the groups who were interviewed, see **Section 5** – which outlines results by stakeholder group type, and includes a description of the actual groups who were included in each stakeholder category.

3.2 INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

All interviews were semi-structured and consisted mostly of open-ended questions. All questions were designed to gain insight into at least one of the key themes identified in table 3. Table 3 lists key themes against research aims and includes a few example interview questions designed to address this aim. Questions were slightly modified to each stakeholder group and in some cases the individual.

Table 2: Research aims, themes and interview questions used

Aim	Theme of question	Questions
To understand how different levels of awareness about the process, interest in the issue, and involvement in the process might influence response	Introduction and context setting Involvement and Awareness	1. How interested is your group in the issue of creating a safe and vibrant nightlife in Sydney? 2. Have you or your group ever made a submission on this issue to government or been involved in decision-making in some other way? 3. Before we contacted you for interview, had you heard of the 'Citizens Policy Jury on a vibrant and Safe Sydney Nightlife ' being run by nDF? 4. How would you describe your level and nature of involvement in this project? 5. How would you describe your level of awareness of this project – its objectives and how it ran?
To be able to say 'these groups trust / don't trust this process….'	First impressions Perceived usefulness Perceived fairness	6. What were your first impressions of the project? 7. How confident were you at the start that this particular process would result in a useful set of recommendations? 8. What is your impression of the fairness of the process?
To be able to say 'these groups may respond like this….' Satisfaction with recommendations – how this links to satisfaction with process	Involvement Attitudes towards their own involvement Changing attitudes over time Satisfaction with outcomes	9. Did your views of the process change over time? If so, how? If not, why? 10. Did your view change when you saw the results? If so, how? If not, why? 11. How valuable do you consider the recommendations that came out of the process to be? 12. Do you have any reservations about supporting the recommendations based on how they were made or who made them?
Provide practical advice that nDF could operationalize **And** Something for nDF to point to say 'look, this works…because… etc', - justify the details of the process.	Thoughts on using these processes in the future: things to avoid; things to include. In general – do they think this type of process has a useful role to play in policy making?	13. What do you feel were the key strengths of the process? / What parts worked well? 14. What do you feel could be done to improve the process? (engagement, activities, outcomes…) 15. Are there any questions you still have about how the process worked – anything you're unclear on? 16. How do you feel about the process in comparison to other community engagement processes? 17. Looking to the future: What is your general attitude toward deliberative democratic processes like the one that just ran? Do you think they are a potentially useful tool for governments in making policy on important issues?

3.3 CONDUCTING INTERVIEWS

ISF was engaged to conduct this research in April 2014. At this stage the participants had been recruited and meetings were taking place. ISF's interviews with stakeholders began just after recommendations were delivered by the Jury; that is, after the Jury had come to a close. The first interview was conducted on the 13th May 2014 and the last on 25th June 2014. A total of ten interviews were conducted.

- Interview questions were designed and reviewed both internally and by nDF (see Table 2 for a summary of interview questions by research aim)
- The interviews went for approximately 45 minutes each.
- Interviewees were not given questions prior to the interview.
- Project information was given in writing to each interviewee - about the research, how their inputs would be used, and about the case study project at the focus of the research
- If the participants had had no direct involvement in the CPJ then the researchers gave a brief verbal overview of that project at the start of the interviews.
- Interviews were held over the phone (8), and face to face (2).
- Interviews were scribed manually
- The scribe and interviewer identified and discussed the key findings from each interview immediately after each interview. This process helped ensure that the scribe's notes were accurately recorded and interpreted, that themes were identified from the data, and that any clarifying questions were identified.
- If anything emerged from the interview that was ambiguous in meaning or needed clarification, this was confirmed with interviewee after the interview.

3.4 ANALYSIS

The interviews were manually coded individually and then analysed for salient themes. The analyses included checking for divergent responses and identifying particular narratives related to the themes of the research: specifically, *awareness of and understanding of process, perceived usefulness and fairness (including trust in the process, convenors, participants), views on the involvement of stakeholders (including their own level of involvement), acceptability of results*, and views on the *use of processes such of these in future, for other issues.*

See Table 2 for the themes explored in the interviews.

4 RESULTS - STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS OF THE JURY

4.1 VIEWS OF THE PROCESS IN GENERAL

This section focuses on views on the process without making distinctions between stakeholders. Section 5 considers differences between stakeholders in more detail.

Section 6 outlines recommendations for future processes made by the interviewees.

4.1.1 Context

Level of interest in, and involvement with, the issue

All interviewees expressed a strong interest in the issue of a vibrant and safe nightlife. Most reported previous participation in the issue, which included making submissions on related policy previous to the Citizens' Policy Jury (hereafter referred to as 'the Jury' or the CPJ) and generally being vocal on the issue. One interviewee reported directly working with the City of Sydney on the issue. The two government representatives worked closely on the issue. For example, one worked on the council's open city strategy, has made submissions to state government enquiries and reviewed related legislation.

All interviewees had some level of involvement in the CPJ. Involvement ranged from minimal, for example, attending the mayoral roundtable, to quite involved, for example, making a submission and presenting to the jury as a selected speaker. Most made a submission and four were speakers.

Two interviewees, who represented organisations that were involved in either funding the CPJ or helping to make it happen, reported deliberately keeping their involvement minimal. Both took this approach to avoid misconceptions that the results were unduly influenced. As one explained:

> *'we took a pretty hands-off approach because of a concern that since we had funded it if we then got involved there may be a perception that we were driving it and influencing the outcomes'.*

Level of awareness and understanding of the process

All interviewees were aware that the Jury had occurred but the level of awareness of key components of the process and the level of understanding of what these key components involved varied significantly.

About half of the interviewees had a limited understanding of the process but had a general appreciation that 'it was setting out to find out what the public were thinking' and most of these people were interested to learn more. For example, three interviewees had heard of the process happening but knew very little about the process. One of these had made a submission on the issue but was unsure as to whether this was part of the CPJ. Another had attended the Mayoral roundtable and had heard about the

CPJ at this event, however knew very little about what the CPJ involved. The other had participated in the submission process but when asked to describe their level of awareness of the CPJ explained they had only 'vaguely heard of it'.

The other half of the interviewees felt and demonstrated a good to thorough understanding of the process, including the purpose of it, recruitment process, submission process and the selection and involvement of speakers. One person who demonstrated a fair understanding of the process explained that from the start they understood the process was a 'model to democratise decision making and provide a representative slice of the population to deliberate on complex and challenging policy areas'. This person noted that their understanding of the process grew with direct engagement with it however they had questions around the details of how the deliberation occurred (in the sessions in which observers were not present).

When asked if they had any questions about the detail of the process, many had at least one question around particular aspects of how it ran. These questions included ones related to details of recruitment and details of how deliberation actually took place when the speakers or observers were not present. Questions around how the deliberation occurred and more specifically how the jury arrived at the final set of recommendations were common. These questions seemed in the most part to be proffered in a spirit of curiosity rather than cynicism or concern about the detail of this process. One interviewee who had a good understanding of most aspects of the CPJ commented that 'it would be interesting to know what problem solving tools the group were given to take the information they had to then arrive at the recommendations'.

Detailed knowledge of the process was not necessarily correlated with either strongly negative, or strongly positive views about the process itself. Of those who were not familiar with the details of the process (such as recruitment, speaker selection, or deliberation method) there were those who strongly supported and those that did not support the 'idea' of the process.

4.1.2 Views on involvement of stakeholders

In the interviews we heard people's perceptions on power, roles and any missing voices from the process.

There was a range of opinions on missing voices from the process. Two participants identified a lack of engagement of residents affected by the issue. One of these felt that local residents who are most greatly impacted by the issue did not have a voice in the process. The other was concerned that older people may have been left out 'because they are not web savvy and most engagement avenues are on the web'. This interviewee noted the significance of engaging older people in this issue because they have specific interests for example around noise and alternative nightlife activities. More generally this interviewee expressed concern around not involving people on the ground that hold deep knowledge of local issues, 'I think it does leave out representatives of community groups who have depth of knowledge that can help inform the recommendations'.

Another interviewee observed that international perspectives were missing. They felt it would have been valuable to include such a voice for the purpose of learning about how other countries deal with this issue. Another interviewee was not able to specifically identify missing voices though commented that 'there needs to be a greater understanding of the problem…to engage the right sorts of people [speakers and submissions]'.

Two interviewees felt that there should be an increased role for stakeholders. One noted that this could be either as speakers, in the jury or even in a separate (parallel) jury. This particular interviewee stated that 'if you're just using a sample of the community and not other stakeholders I would be concerned'. This interviewee felt that if the government only listens to the community than the recommendations would 'definitely be skewed…it wouldn't be a rounded result. You wouldn't get a broad context.' The other interviewee who felt there should be greater involvement from stakeholders questioned who decided on where the jury went on the tour and stated that 'we would have liked to have had some input into that so that they [the jury] had a fair impression of what goes on'. They felt 'there's potential there for some engineering of what they [the jury] see unless it's made transparent'.

On the other hand another interviewee felt the process provided opportunities for all stakeholders to have a voice. They noted that with this process stakeholders still have a voice to council through their traditional communication channels, plus an opportunity to make a submission and thus the potential to also be invited by the jury to be a speaker, which this speaker felt made the process 'very open and fair'.

There were varied opinions on the level and nature of involvement of government. One interviewee felt that the process would have benefited from greater involvement of government: 'the process needs a greater level of involvement of the people who would be implementing the recommendations'. They also commented that 'government could access stakeholders [for the submission process] that nDF couldn't access'. This contrasted with the view of two other interviewees who expressed distrust in the government. They both felt the government would 'cherry-pick' the recommendations that suited their agendas and ignore those that didn't. One of these interviewees also had a strong view that the AHA is always at the table and listened to because of financial reasons and their desire to 'get votes'. In addition to these views, a different interviewee, who had been a speaker, expressed some concern around the role the CoS had played. In their role as speaker they noticed that all groups had identified one particular issue, 'there seemed to be an issue that everyone was talking about so it seemed to me that perhaps the CoS had pushed this issue before hand'.

Satisfaction with role

Half the interviewees expressed that they were satisfied with their level and nature of involvement. The level of satisfaction ranged from expectations being met to being very happy. One of these expressed that they were satisfied with their role though would have liked to have been engaged with deciding on where the jury went on the tour.

Three other interviewees however were not satisfied. One of these noted 'we would have liked to have been more involved'. Another explained that they had made a submission but felt it had been 'a waste of time'. One interviewee, who had been involved through the Mayoral roundtable only, felt the government engages stakeholders in a patchy and inconsistent manner. They explained 'I was happy to be asked to be at the roundtable but I feel as though the involvement stopped there…if you're going to ask a stakeholder to sit around a roundtable you should probably ask them to give more input'.

Two interviewees, who were speakers, were happy to have been involved in this way, however one felt that 10 minutes [to present to the jury] was not enough time to get into the issues, 'if the purpose was to give the jury enough information on the issue it wasn't the best way to do it'.

4.1.3 Value of using processes like this in other contexts

Most saw value in the use of this type of process by governments in different contexts in future. One interviewee felt that 'it's a great system'. They backed this opinion up with a comment around the commitment the State government had made to table the outcomes and the observation that 'the CoS has already started implementing recommendations that they didn't have already'. Both of the government representatives saw great value in this type of decision-making process going forward. One expressed that they feel the process of a Citizen Policy Jury is 'very valuable…would love to see this used for other things we do'. This interviewee commented that it would be particularly constructive in the policy formation stage. They felt it could then bring a new voice and greater depth to decision processes. The other government representative stated that '**what they [nDF] do is very good and can make a significant contribution to the policy process. I think it's beneficial across all tiers of government'.** They then specified that it would be most valuable in policy areas where government doesn't already have a strong policy position because 'if it [the recommendation report] comes out against a firm position it would be difficult and if it aligns there would be a perception issue – people wouldn't trust it'.

While some interviewees strongly supported the process in its current form, others were generally supportive but specified conditions for their support. A couple of interviewees felt that the CPJ offers value as a future community engagement process so long as it used alongside other forms of stakeholder engagement. One person expressed 'I think it's a new and innovative way of gaining feedback though it shouldn't be the only way'. Another stated that **'if this works with other things [forms of stakeholder engagement] it is to be welcomed'.** A different interviewee felt that this is a useful process but noted the value of other community engagement methods and the need to weigh up the costs and benefits of each. A key benefit that this stakeholder saw in the CPJ process was that 'it gives you commitment from community that gives you depth to community thought and therefore robust outcomes'.

Two interviewees felt there was **little value in the process** though in both cases this seemed strongly related to **distrust in government**. For example, when one of these

interviewees was asked what this process would be like if it were to be effective they responded: 'it's not about listening. The government know what to do but they won't do it'. The other interviewee was not as sceptical. Whilst they had their criticisms they also said that if a similar process were to run in the future they would like to be involved. The explained that if 'if it was going to happen in the future we would need more openness and transparency, for example how people came to be involved and selected'.

Comparison to other forms of community engagement

Half of the interviewees compared this process favourably to other forms of community engagement.

When asked to compare the CPJ to other forms of community engagement positive responses included:

- 'It was a lot less biased than any other government processes I have been involved with'.
- 'The process allowed the State government to sit aside from its own ideas and listen to the community'.
- 'Because it's in a structured format you get to see both sides of the story – speak your own mind. It's one of the more reasonable processes'. This comment should be read in the context that this interviewee felt the results in this case were reasonable, which this interviewee acknowledged influenced his perception of the process.
- 'The jury itself gives a legitimacy solo voices don't'. This interviewee also felt that this process delivered more balanced, less bias, less polarized outcomes.

One interviewee who saw value in many community engagement methods identified that key strengths of the CPJ above other methods included that 'it engaged a decent number of citizens from a range of perspectives and maintained their engagement and commitment for a significant period of time'. They felt that this enabled the community to become informed about the issue and to enter into in-depth discussions about it.

The other half felt fairly neutral about the CPJ when comparing it to other forms of community engagement. In some cases this seemed to be due to a lack of understanding of what the CPJ involved compared to other community engagement processes. Two interviewees felt the CPJ was similar to other community engagement processes. One felt the differences were negligible as they believe that it comes down to what the government does with the outputs and that 'unless it's what they want to hear they won't do anything with them'. The other interviewee felt that the CPJ was roughly the same as other forms of engagement, if not worse because they felt it didn't enable wider participation,

> *'It seems the bigger ones [larger community engagement processes] have provided more room for residents. At these you can at least see it and participate, whereas with this one [the CPJ] there were people who didn't really have a voice'.*

One interviewee shared positive experiences with other forms of community engagement and based on these noted the value of conversations between active local resident groups/ community members and professional staff of government or developers, and the value of workshops, which facilitate these kinds of conversations.

Trust in the process

Most interviewees trusted the process. Three interviewees reported being optimistic with the process from the start. One of these felt that the State government's commitment to 'table the results in parliament' and the local government's commitment to respond to each of the Jury's recommendations gave it credibility from the start. Another explained that they were confident with the process from the beginning: **'these issues get so charged with agendas and I saw this approach as enabling citizens to look at the issue free of those charged opinions/agendas'.** This interviewee, who had experienced the jury when addressing them as a speaker, observed that the process 'seems a very transparent process and not steered by anyone'. One reported that 'you get sceptical about these things when you first hear about them' but went on to say they were optimistic from the start, 'I had seen the work of the S.A process so I had confidence in the process'. This interviewee's confidence increased with their involvement in the process, as did a couple of others. One expressed that by the end they felt that the process was very fair and open.

Two others reported that their trust in the process increased as they learnt more about the process (either through direct engagement with the process or learning more about the process during the interview), including learning about the final recommendations. One interviewee who had a low understanding of the process became more trusting of it once the process was explained to them.

Three other interviewees expressed trust in the process overall however had some comments around particular aspects of the process. For example, one interviewee described 'my impression was that it was objective and those involved were trying to make it meaningful'. However this interviewee also expressed considerable concern around the way the issue was framed. They noted their awareness that '**organisations will frame things in the way of the outcome they want to see**…it may be that they intended for these recommendations – they may have been after positive, fuzzy recommendations'. Another interviewee who expressed trust in the process overall was concerned that there are opportunities to skew the process and therefore the results. However, interestingly, they didn't feel the process was skewed in this case because they felt the recommendations were reasonable.

On the other hand two interviewees expressed significant distrust in the process. In both cases this seemed to be due to past experience with government processes. One explained that 'there has been huge scepticism on how it was run. We have been involved in similar processes that were totally contrived and that were dictated by a specific agenda…they [CoS] totally engineer it, they don't listen to external opinions. They take what they want and listen more to the few businesses and representations of the AHA

than anyone else'. The other mirrored this by expressing their feeling that the government will only listen to whatever supports their own agenda.

4.1.4 Views on the details of the process

Recruitment process

Most interviewees felt the recruitment process was robust. When asked about the recruitment process one interviewee responded:

> *'I have no concern at all. As far as I know it was objective. They engaged the right people. It was a lot less bias than any other government processes have been involved with. This is a strength of the process.'*

Another expressed great trust in the recruitment process, 'it was like a microcosm of Sydney when I stepped into the room'. This interviewee also felt that a key strength of the process was 'the random selection of the jurors. This was pure gold.' Another explained that 'the jury selection process was a pretty solid one in terms of diversity. I don't think you can question the fairness of this process.' Another had 'no issues with how the citizen's jury is developed. I understand it's representative of solely residents around the area.'

Two interviewees expressed a general trust in the recruitment of jurors however raised some minor concerns. One of these expressed that 'the danger of the rigid demographic approach is that you miss out on important voices' and for this reason 'it should be seen as a complimentary to other forms [of stakeholder engagement]. The other was reasonably satisfied that the recruitment process was robust and resulted in a demographically representative sample of the population however had a question around how the final selection of jurors was made. This was based on a direct experience with the process whereby their child had been contacted in the initial round of recruitment and then was not contacted after that.

Only one person expressed strong cynicism about the recruitment process. They felt that people who are not directly affected by the issue were invited to be part of the jury. They felt the method of selecting the jury was unduly influenced by the agenda of the CoS and that the method of selection was 'stacked'. They explained 'we heard that the process involved people who don't live in the area…it would have been more fair if people from our postcode were invited to be involved – the people who are affected.'

Submissions

Not many of the interviewees had a lot to say about the submission process[7]. In one case this was because of a lack of awareness of the submission process. In other cases there was awareness that it had occurred but no concern in the process was expressed. However one interviewee who didn't raise specific concern over the submission process did express a concern in general about how older people were engaged. The concern

---

[7] See Appendix 1 for more information about submissions made to the Jury

was that the engagement methods are not effective for older people who may not be web-savvy.

Two interviewees specifically expressed satisfaction with the submission process. Both demonstrated an appreciation that anyone could make a submission, which they felt contributed to making this a fair and open process overall. One of these interviewees also felt that stakeholders who usually have a strong voice were not heard as loudly and that the process created greater opportunities for more diverse voices to be heard. However, although this interviewee felt everyone had an opportunity to have a say he questioned how many people were aware of this opportunity. This mirrors the concern of another interviewee, who questioned the process of how nDF advertised the opportunity to make a submission:

> *'I don't know how proactively nDF sought out people to make submissions…there would have been a lot more people engaged in this issue if they knew they had the opportunity'.*

One of these interviewees also felt that the there might be a perception issue around nDF,

> *'People receiving the invite to make a submission might be thinking who are these people? Is this a serious inquiry or a random link that might hack our business?'*

In relation to the above quote this interviewee felt that this is maybe due to a lack of public awareness and profile of the nDF, and 'so because of the lack of awareness of nDF it makes it harder for them attract submissions'.

One interviewee felt the submission process was a waste of time. However this interviewee was sceptical of the whole CPJ process, which seemed to be based on their past experience with government engagement processes, including submitting a proposal to Council on this issue for which they had received no response.

Speakers

Half the interviewees were satisfied with the process of selecting speakers[8] to address the jury, and had no specific suggestions for change. A few particularly valued that the jury could invite whomever they wanted to hear from and felt that the selection of speakers was 'a good representative cross section of the different views within the sector'. As another expressed,

> *'I think the fact that there was an opportunity to take in evidence from a range of different sources and be exposed to a range of different agendas was so great and such a rare thing in policy making'.*

Three interviewees who expressed an overall satisfaction in both how speakers were selected and the range of speakers did however have some comments around voices that they felt would have been valuable for the jury to hear from. One of these felt that 'it would have been interesting to have someone from some of the venues, for example the

---

[8] See Appendix 1 for an overview of how speakers were selected, Appendix 2 for a detailed list of requests for speakers from the Jury

Star [in Pyrmont]'. Another of these identified that there were a few important voices missing and that part of the reason for this was that 'some people (who had been invited) were away or not given enough notice'. Another felt that there was a lack of representation of people in favour of a late night economy, and another 'found it astounding that there was no researchers invited to speak. There was no one talking about violence or alcohol from a research perspective. That was a huge omission from my point of view'. This interviewee also expressed an issue with timing; they felt the speakers were not given enough time to present and answer questions,

> *'When you are trying to talk about this issue there is so much to discuss and not enough time was available…if the purpose is to give the jury enough information on the issue it wasn't the best way to do it'.*

Two interviewees were sceptical of the process in which speakers were selected. One felt that the average person wouldn't know who to choose and the other was 'highly sceptical – when we heard that the AHA were invited to speak we then lost all confidence'.

4.1.5 Views on outputs

Acceptability of recommendations

Half (five) of the interviewees were relatively satisfied to very happy with the recommendations. Three interviewees felt they could not comment, as they did not have a great awareness of the recommendations. Two were critical of them.

Of those satisfied with the recommendations, three interviewees were very happy with the recommendations. One interviewee thought the recommendations were thorough and valid,

> '*We've been looking at this problem for a while and I was quite happy with the recommendations. There's nothing glaringly obvious that they're missing…they're quite rational'*.

Another said they had been optimistic with the results from the start because of their experience with the S.A case and that the final results confirmed a sense of trust in the process as they felt they delivered 'something quite democratic, something in the middle, quite considered, not polarised like other processes'. This interviewee found the recommendations 'really valuable', 'for us they are great because it makes us feel that we are on the right track and we just have to get on with what we're doing'.

Two interviewees expressed an overall satisfaction in the recommendations though had some comments around how useful the individual recommendations are as they currently stand. One of these gave specific feedback on individual recommendations – some positive and some negative. The other felt that more is needed to be able to action the recommendations,

> '*overall it [the recommendation report] could go deeper…it needs to be unwrapped to then take and implement…it needs more detail – two lines on each recommendation is not enough'*.

However, in relation to the opinion above this interviewee acknowledged that 'from this we do have a management plan'. The other, who noted a couple of recommendations that they didn't support was able to look broadly at the recommendations and from this perspective found them to be reasonable.

One of the interviewees satisfied with the recommendations also noted that the recommendations did not include suggestions to change registration or sentencing in relation to offenders of alcohol related violent crime, which could be part of a response to this issue, but noted that this was appropriate because it was beyond the scope of what the jury was asked to consider[9]. This didn't affect their overall satisfaction with the recommendations.

The two interviewees who were critical with the recommendations expressed significant dissatisfaction. One had the perception that the speakers were invited by the CoS and this led to questionable results, in terms of the content of the recommendations. As this interviewee explained,

> *'The gossip and reporting was that the Potts Point partnership and members of the AHA were allowed to address the group and argue their case but there wasn't any representation of residents to the group, so resident views were completely ignored. That alone was enough to completely discredit the outcomes the jury arrived at'.*

The other critical voice was strongly against the recommendations but didn't specify what they would have liked to have seen as alternate recommendations. They felt that the recommendations were too diverse and did not address the actual problem,

> *'I don't think they [the recommendations] say anything new. Transport is always the first thing that gets brought up, police and safety – this is always the answer from people who are not too aware of the issue'.*

This interviewee then described reasons for why they felt the recommendations were not strong in their opinion. This interviewee explained that they felt the jury was 'enthusiastic, smart and engaged' but that there was an issue with 'how the problem was framed…it steered the conversation and recommendations away from the actual issue of violence at night'. They also felt the recommendations demonstrated that 'this group was not given enough information to address the particular issues'.

Willingness to accept the recommendations

Most of the interviewees expressed a willingness to accept the recommendations. However, amongst these interviewees most expressed this willingness on a conditional basis. For example, one interviewee expressed a willingness to accept the

---

[9] In addition, as described previously, the state government had made some licensing decisions just several days before the CPJ started. This may have affected what the participants considered in terms of policy responses, because they felt that the issue of licensing had already been recently addressed by government and thus was not worth focusing on in their recommendations.

recommendations but stressed the importance of viewing them alongside other forms of community engagement. This mirrored the opinion of another interviewee who values community input but emphasised the importance of listening to other stakeholder voices alongside the community,

> *'What ever they [the community] are talking about, the ideas and suggestions they come up with, that's interesting and more than fine because it's representative of that sample. But when it comes to taking that information to support policy movement I don't support that only this voice influences it…to result in meaningful policy you would need a jury of the industry and other stakeholders. Everyone's views should be shared.'*

These responses contrasted the view of one interviewee who seemed to value the outcomes of the jury over other forms of stakeholder input. They saw legitimacy in this voice of the community over other community voices, for example the loud and critical voices that will always be there, and commented that the jury helps water down the voice of lobbyists.

One interviewee expressed that the organisation they were representing is 'philosophically supportive of the process of involving community in policy decision-making' but acknowledged their awareness and concern for the risks involved around the lack of control of outcomes. Although this interviewee no longer works at the organisation they were representing, and thus felt that they couldn't comment on their willingness to accept the recommendations, they did however express that risks associated with a lack of control of outcomes were outweighed by the benefits of the process.

A couple of interviewees, who were happy with the recommendations and willing to accept them, specified a need to do more work on them to enable implementation.

No one was strongly opposed to accepting them however a few expressed some reservation. In all cases the reservation seemed to be related to either scepticism about the process or a general distrust in government, as opposed to a lack of trust in the capacity of the jury to make valuable recommendations. For example one interviewee explained that 'in a media article it was reported that one of the participants wasn't able to get their views across, so that's where I lost a lot of interest'. Another, who stated 'it had potential to be a fantastic process', felt the recommendations 'missed the mark' because of the way the issue was framed. 'If they hit the issue front on I feel we could have got a valuable outcome'. The other interviewee, when asked about their willingness to accept the recommendations, simply reiterated his strong belief that no recommendations will be listened to unless they align with what the government already wants to do.

5 PERCEPTIONS OF THE JURY ACROSS DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDER CATEGORIES

This section examines the results of the interviews by stakeholder type. Quotes from interviews are repeated between sections 4 and 5 so that these sections can be read as stand alone summaries of the results, depending on whether one is most interested in views of the process by a range of stakeholders, or the views of specific stakeholders.

5.1.1 Stakeholder categories

This part of the analysis identifies key points of difference and commonality within and between different stakeholder categories. It focuses on perceptions on the strengths and weaknesses of CPJs, specific concerns about the CPJ on a Vibrant and Safe Sydney Nightlife, and overall value of these types of processes going forward.

The stakeholder categories that we have used to conduct the following cross comparative analysis are those developed by Hendricks (2011). Hendricks developed these typologies based on different primary motivating interests of stakeholders, as opposed to other aspects of a group such as organisational structure, membership or internal communication processes (Hendricks, 2011: p236). See Table 1 for how these categories have been used for this research.

The key difference between Hendricks' category of 'support groups' and 'public interest advocates' is that the primary motivating interest of a support group is that of its members, whereas public interest advocates also have an outward community orientation in terms of public education and advocacy. Hendricks' categories of 'government organisations' and 'professional organisations and experts' are differentiated by their relationship to government, whereby government organisations are those who are either government bodies or otherwise exist due to government funding and, while professional organisations and experts may advise government, the examples Hendricks gives for this group have a more independent status to government.

Whilst we appreciated the differences between these stakeholder categories when we were conducting the stakeholder mapping process we experienced some challenges when grouping potential interviewees to the stakeholder categories due to what we considered to be a blurring of boundaries. For example, would a doctor working in a public hospital best fit under the 'government organisation' or 'professional organisation/expert' group? Similarly we experienced a blurring of boundaries with an organisation who focuses on alcohol research and education; we felt that this organisation could fit into both the 'public interest advocate' and the 'professional organisations and experts' group.

5.1.2 Public interest advocates

About the public interest advocacy organisations interviewed

Three of the interviewees fell under this category. One represented an independent national organisation that conducts research and education on alcohol. The other two represented community groups that aim to improve the quality of life of their communities. One specified that they work with local and state government to improve the physical and social environment of its community and that its membership is open to local business and residents. All three of these interviewees made a submission to the CPJ and one was also an invited speaker. All interviewees had a limited understanding of the details of the CPJ process; the invited speaker had some understanding due to their greater involvement and the other two had very limited awareness of how the speakers were selected and the jury ran.

Perceived strengths and weaknesses of these types of processes

i) Strengths

All of these interviewees found it challenging to identify strengths of the process. Only one interviewee in this stakeholder category (the invited speaker) was able to identify strengths of the process. These strengths were the recruitment process and that they felt the process is 'less biased than other government processes'. The other two interviewees could not identify any. However, although this is understandable as all of these interviewees had a limited understanding of what the CPJ process involved, one interviewee was particularly cynical. When this interviewee was asked to identify key strengths of the process they responded 'can't say, don't think there are any. I feel they [nDF] were hired by CoS; there was no input; highly dubious findings all round'. The other who could not identify any process strengths simply did not have a great understanding of the process, however they did demonstrate a great appreciation of the importance of conversations. When asked about their experience with other community engagement processes she responded that

> *'Conversations are key…need to have more conversations between the planners, developers, and the community…It's great to have experts speak but also important to have community voice'.*

From this feedback on experience with other community engagement processes we infer that this interviewee would see the ability of the jury to listen and ask questions of speakers to be valuable and a strength of the process, as would the conversations that happen during the entire process and deliberation.

ii) Weaknesses

Although all three interviewees had a limited understanding of what the process involved all of them identified a few weaknesses of the process. The interviewee who had addressed the jury as an invited speaker was very disappointed and critical of how the issue was framed. This seemed to be their greatest concern as they felt this drove the recommendations away from the actual issue. It should be noted here that the issue had

been framed in a positive way so to mirror the framing of the South Australian CPJ, as identified in section 1. This interviewee also felt that not enough time had been given to the speakers to present or answer the questions of each group. As a result this interviewee felt that the conversations lacked depth. In discussing the issue of timing they commented that there were potentially too many people involved to discuss issues effectively in the room. Their other critique related to the open submission process, they felt that not many people knew of this opportunity.

The weaknesses identified by the other two interviewees were more general. One simply felt that older people need to have greater involvement in these processes, 'older people are often left out because they are not web savvy and most engagement avenues are on the web'. This interviewee also felt that the recruitment process took a rigid demographic approach and that a consequence of this is that 'you miss out on important voices'. This didn't seem to be a deal breaker for this interviewee – they simply followed this up by suggesting that it should be used alongside other forms of engagement. The other interviewee was highly critical and listed several weaknesses including a lack of transparency, the recruitment process (whereby she felt that the selection process of the jury was not open or fair and that the sample was 'meddled with'), and lacked engagement with residents. They also felt that other engagement processes provide greater opportunity for more stakeholders to be involved and that government will only listen to the outcomes if they fit with their agenda.

Public interest advocates: value of the process going forward

Two of the interviewees in this stakeholder category saw potential value in this process going forward.

One expressed an overall sense of value in the process even though they were critical of several aspects. This interviewee felt the process 'seems fantastic on paper' and was aware that it had worked 'really well in other areas like planning'. S/he felt that perhaps it works well in planning because there is a greater understanding of the issues in that context.

The other saw value in the process overall but emphasised the need to balance it with local community voices and other forms of engagement, 'if this works with other things it is to be welcomed'. This interviewee also noted that 'timing is crucial' and that the CPJ would need to occur 'pre-design phase/pre-putting out to tender'. S/he felt that under such circumstances 'this process could be used for planning decisions'.

The interviewee who did not see value in the process when asked whether they felt it had potential future use responded,

> 'No, because they have been run so poorly...they push issues under the ground. They run their own agenda, which creates wide spread cynicism. People become less inclined to participate which is really sad because community know and understand local issues'.

It seemed this interviewees opinion on the process was tainted by their experience with

other forms of community engagement run by the CoS, 'they [CoS] totally engineer it, they don't listen to external opinions, they take what they want and listen more to the few business representatives from AHA than anyone else'.

5.1.3 Support groups

About the support groups interviewed

Only one interviewee fell under this category. This interviewee represented an organisation that focuses on issues around alcohol and youth. It aims to curb alcohol-fuelled violence by 'teaching youth values so that they are not committing violence when they get older'. This interviewee was the driving force behind the CPJ on a Safe and Vibrant Sydney Nightlife, however their involvement in the actual process was limited; they made a submission and assisted nDF in contacting speakers that the Jury had selected. This interviewee had come across nDF and the Citizen's Jury that nDF had conducted in South Australia on the same issue. This interviewee felt that he had exhausted most options to drive legislative change and felt that this, the Citizen's Jury, was the last option. This interviewee had a thorough understanding of all aspects of the process.

Perceived strengths and weaknesses of these types of processes

i) Strengths

When this interviewee was asked what they considered to be the key strengths of this process the first thing they identified was the partners, 'Commitment from key players and that they put money toward it'. Secondly, they identified the outcomes, explaining that they were 'reflective of a community voice – independent voice saying this is what we think should happen; that's powerful'. Throughout the interview this interviewee identified other strengths of the process including the selection process for speakers, they commented that it was 'fantastic that the jury could choose who ever they wanted [to hear from], it's a great system'. They also noted that they liked that this 'process allowed the State Government to sit aside from its own ideas and to listen to the community'.

ii) Weaknesses

The key weaknesses that this interviewee identified related to issues of timing and the actual output (recommendation report). As to timing they were concerned that not enough time had been given to the invited speakers to respond to the invitation to speak, and also that the speakers did not have enough time to address the jury and answer the juror's questions. They had 'heard from others who had been at some of the sessions and who had spoken to the jury that they had other ideas that they didn't have an opportunity to explore or put in'. They also questioned whether the jury were given enough time to deliberate and expressed concern about how minority voices were incorporated. They had 'heard that there were a lot of people that wanted things in the recommendations but they weren't included' and 'wondered if this was because of time – did they need more time?

This interviewee thought that if the jury had more time they might have come up with more innovative ideas. They also identified that the process lacked global perspectives and that 'we should be looking at what the rest of the world is doing'.

As to the final recommendation report, although this interviewee expressed great value in obtaining the community voice, they felt that the recommendations lacked depth, 'overall it could go deeper…it needs more detail – two lines on each recommendation is not enough'. However, they acknowledged that 'from this [the recommendations] we do have a management plan'. They believe that now 'it needs to be unwrapped to then take and implement' and that this requires an 'independent board who is not influenced by interested stakeholders to advise on what to do about the issue'.

Support groups: value of the process going forward

With the support group interviewed there was strong interest in this type of process as a way to gear from diverse citizens on key topical issues.

Overall this interviewee was broadly happy with this process and feels it could have application widely across government, 'it's a great system - O'Farrell committed and the CoS has already started implementing recommendations that they didn't already have'. They felt that the process has potential to drive legislative change. This is significant considering that this interviewee had spent great efforts to change the laws around alcohol-fuelled violence via a number of avenues with no success,

> *'I could see no other way that I could influence the government, but I thought I could do it through the community. With trying to make changes to the law everyone thinks it's a good process, except for the law community'.*

They expressed that a benefit of this process is that the outcome is a community voice, which incorporates many different interests and perspectives, as opposed to an individual organisational voice, which from this interviewee's experience cannot drive the change needed in this context.

5.1.4 Commercial organisations

About the commercial organisations interviewed

Three of the interviewees fell under this category. One was an industry advocacy group operating in NSW, another was a not-for-profit industry body - the industry bodies represent different aspects of the economic activity related to alcohol. The third was a small business alliance, which aims to build a better community spirit, social environment and a successful business centre in its local area. This alliance is made up of less than 10 committee members. Two interviewees had very limited involvement in the process; one of these made a submission and the other attended the Mayoral Roundtable. The other interviewee had made a submission and presented to the jury as an invited speaker. This interviewee, who had the greatest level of involvement, had a thorough understanding of the process. The two who had limited involvement knew very little about the process. To

demonstrate, the interviewee who had attended the Mayoral Roundtable only knew it involved randomly selected citizens coming together to help inform policy but was not aware of the submission process, the recruitment process, how the speakers were selected and was not aware of the recommendations. The other interviewee with limited knowledge demonstrated a general sense of the purpose of the process, 'it was setting out to find out what the public were thinking'. However, he was not aware of how the process was conducted.

Perceived strengths and weaknesses of these types of processes

i) Strengths

The interviewee who demonstrated a thorough understanding of the process identified several strengths of the process. The key strengths that they identified were the upfront support from local and state government and the fairness of the jury,

> *'From the beginning, the fact that it had local and state support for the process I think empowered the jury, rather than them thinking that no one would listen to them, that it was just a ticketed exercise'.*

In relation to the fairness of the jury they stated that 'they [the jury] did take the issue and work seriously; they tried to take their personal views out of it'. This interviewee also liked that 'because it's a structured format you get to see both sides of the story – speak your mind'. The two interviewees with limited involvement and understanding of the process found it difficult to articulate any strengths. Though after listening to some detail on the process one felt it seemed like a 'new and innovative way of gaining feedback'.

ii) Weaknesses

All interviewees expressed several concerns about the process. The interviewee who had most involvement in the process identified a couple of weaknesses. Firstly, they identified that there was no engagement with industry about where the jury went on tour,

> *'We [industry] would have liked to have had some input so that they [the jury] had a fair impression of what goes on. There's a potential for some engineering of what they see unless this is made transparent. I don't feel this happened in this case but there is potential for this with this process'.*

Secondly, they raised a concern about the information presented to the jury. They felt that opportunities exist to tailor the information to meet certain aims. In particular s/he was concerned that 'the agenda could be set by others who select the initial speakers who may align with an external agenda'. Other concerns this interviewee had were that 'people have to consider things over a period of time so perhaps 4-5 sessions meant they [the jury] had to work over the clock'. In addition, s/he expressed some concern that 'it was going up on the website'. They felt this 'may cause you to guard what you say'.

The two interviewees with a limited understanding of the process had some general feedback about weaknesses of the process/areas of concern. The concerns of the interviewee who had attended the Mayoral Roundtable only related to the involvement of

stakeholders in the process. They felt that there is 'patchy involvement of stakeholders by governments on issues such as these…it was great to be invited to be on the roundtable but I felt we were dropped off along the way'. They also felt that there should be an increased role for stakeholders, either as participants or as speakers as he felt that only listening to the community would skew the results. The other interviewee with limited understanding of the process was not able to articulate specific weaknesses though expressed significant criticism, which seemed to be based on a great distrust in government as a result of past and current experiences, 'when they [government] have their own agenda they get people together but they don't listen. They satisfy their own agenda'. This interviewee also had a strong view that the AHA is always at the table and listened to because of 'money reasons', s/he felt the submission process was a waste of time and also that 'the average person wouldn't know who to chose' (in regards to the selection of speakers process).

Commercial organisations: value of the process going forward

With the three commercial organisations interviewed there were mixed views about the value of this type of process in future decision making – two suggesting that it is a useful tool for government, and one seeing little value in this or other consultative processes.

Two of the three interviewees saw value in this process going forward. One of these was the interviewee who had a thorough understanding of the process. This interviewee saw it as a valuable tool for government, 'I think it is a tool government should use'. However, they identified a few conditions for its use as a valuable tool. For example, they followed up their comment that the 'government should use it' with the statement 'so long as the processes are appropriately conducted'. They expanded on this by identifying a few aspects of the process that they consider important to ensure its future value. S/he believes it has potential to be a valuable future tool so long as, 'the process is transparent and fair about the speakers who first address the jury', industry stakeholders are involved in who decides where the jury goes on their tour, and that 'the jury is made up independently' and are exposed to informative speakers.

The other interviewee who saw potential value in the process did not have an in depth understanding of the process but did feel that it has potential to be a valuable future tool so long as it is complimented with other forms of stakeholder involvement, 'I think it's a new and innovative way of gaining feedback but it shouldn't be the only way; one of many options but definitely a valid one'.

The third interviewee in this stakeholder category saw little future value in the process; they could not identify any strengths in the process and when asked what it might look like if it were to be effective he responded, 'it's not about listening. The government know what to do but they just wont do it.'

5.1.5 Views of Government organisations interviewed

About the government organisations interviewed

Two of the interviewees fell under this category. One was a local council and the other a State government. One described their level of involvement as significant; they were involved in the decision to conduct the process, contributed to funding the project, made a submission, presented to the jury and put together the itinerary for the tour. The other described their level of involvement as low; apart from being a driving force behind the process they (the organisation that this interviewee represented) took a 'pretty hands off approach'. This was to avoid any misconceptions that they would have influence over the outcomes.

Both interviewees had a reasonable understanding of the process. One noted that they had attended a briefing from Lyn Carson on mini publics and so from the start saw it as 'a model to democratize decision making and provide a representative slice of the population to deliberate on complex and challenging policy areas'. This interviewee also noted that their level of understanding of the process increased with direct engagement with it, though questions remained about how the deliberation occurred. The other interviewee had conducted some research into nDF's work prior to the process and demonstrated a general awareness of what the process involved. However, this interviewee described their level of understanding of the process as 'fairly high level' (i.e. not a detailed understanding), and felt this was due to the fact that they had deliberately kept their distance from the process to avoid misconceptions about influencing it (as stated above).

Perceived strengths and weaknesses of these types of processes

i) Strengths

One interviewee, when asked what they felt were the key strengths of this process, responded, 'the random selection of jurors, pure gold; and the selection of speakers.' This interviewee compared the CPJ process with her experience with other community engagement processes and felt that this delivered more balanced, less biased, less polarized outcomes, 'these processes deliver something quite democratic, something in the middle, quite considered; not polarized like other processes'. Other elements of the process that this interviewee expressed an appreciation for included the fairness of the process and 'the tools the jury were given to critically analyse the material presented to them'. The other interviewee felt the key strength of the process was giving community an opportunity to participate in policy development. This interviewee identified that 'the benefit is that through the process and theory you have something that should reflect the community view of how to solve the issue'. They felt that this is in the interest of the community, via community ownership of policy, but also of the government because 'if government can make policy knowing there is support it makes it easier to implement the policy',

> *'You engage community and enable them to have a say in policy development and therefore they have ownership of any outcomes. So if it goes well then terrific and if it doesn't then we can say well this is what the community wanted'.*

Another strength of this process that this interviewee identified is that the stakeholders who usually have a strong voice are not heard as loudly and that the process creates greater opportunities for more diverse voices to be heard.

> *'You probably wouldn't have had the usual suspects having as strong a say, for example the Alcohol and Hotel Association… everyone was given an opportunity to make a submission.'*

ii) Weaknesses

The interviewee in this stakeholder category who was more involved with the process was very optimistic and could not identify any particular weaknesses. However when asked for ideas to improve the process this interviewee noted that there was an inconsistency in location of where the Jury met, 'I did notice the consistency in venue…it jumped around a bit; I think a consistent place is important'. The other interviewee identified a few weaknesses with the process. They felt the submission process could have been improved,

> *'I don't know about how many people were aware of this opportunity (submission process)/how nDF did this. We would usually help with the submission process and we didn't on this occasion as we wanted to keep our distance'.*

This interviewee also felt that one weakness might be in the lack of reputation and awareness of nDF amongst the community, 'people receiving the invite to make a submission might be thinking who are these people? Is this a serious inquiry or a random thing that might hack at our business?' They felt the process could be improved if government had greater involvement as they could access stakeholders for the submission process that nDF might not be able to access. They also identified that greater government engagement would strengthen the process as government will usually be the one implementing the recommendations.

Government organisations: value of the process going forward

Both interviewees saw great value in this process going forward. Both would recommend it for future use within a government policy setting context.

As one explained, it's 'very valuable…would love to see this used for other things we do'. This interviewee felt that it would be particularly constructive in the policy formation stage as it adds a new voice and depth to the decision process. The other interviewee thought that 'what they [nDF] do is very good and can make a significant contribution to the policy process…I think it's beneficial across all tiers of government'. This interviewee also articulated when they thought this process would be most beneficial in the policy setting context, 'I think it would be most beneficially used when government doesn't already have a firm policy position'.

Official State Government response to the recommendations

The NSW government's public response[10] demonstrates an overall support of the Jury's recommendations and suggests that the government considers most of the issues raised to be legitimate. The response includes feedback on each recommendation; sometimes this is limited to a simple statement 'Supported', other times a more detailed response is provided for example an outline of activities that currently address (in full or in part) a particular recommendation or otherwise a justification for not supporting. In summary, of the 25 recommendations, 15 were either 'supported' or 'supported in principle', 4 were not supported and 6 were either 'supported in part' or 'noted'. Whilst several responses detail activities that the government is either currently conducting, which align with particular recommendations, and/or plans to conduct activities which are being designed to address issues raised in the recommendations, it is not clear whether the recommendations have influenced these activities/plans.

Official Local Government response to the recommendations

The City of Sydney considered the CPJ's recommendations at its meeting on 12 May 2014 and noted that eight of the 25 recommendations were in areas where the City is able to take action. Council endorsed these eight recommendations and outlined an action plan in response to the recommendations.

10

http://www.newdemocracy.com.au/docs/activeprojects/Government%20response%20to%20Citizens%20Jury%20recommendations_Final.pdf

5.1.6 Views of Professional organisations and experts interviewed

About the professional organisations interviewed

One interviewee fell under this category. This interviewee was representing a research centre that explores complex crime problems and innovative methods for crime prevention. Alcohol related problems have been a major focus for the centre, which works collaboratively with other stakeholders. This interviewee was an invited speaker to the jury and he demonstrated a reasonable understanding of the process. He had been to a Roundtable hosted by Clover Moore where she updated the participants on what they were going to do and he demonstrated an understanding of the purpose, the random selection process, and that the jury invited the speakers. However he was not clear on how the jury arrived at the final set of recommendations, 'it would be interesting to know what problem solving tools the group was given to take the information they had to then arrive at the recommendations'.

Perceived strengths and weaknesses of these types of processes

i) Strengths

This interviewee identified several strengths of the CPJ process,

> *'The openness from the start; the random selection; calling for submissions, which allowed anyone to submit; and making up their [the jury's] own mind about who to listen to. It seems a very transparent process and not steered by anyone; quite a pragmatic approach. They're the main strengths'.*

When asked to compare this process with other forms of community engagement he identified additional strengths, 'a strength in comparison is that they [nDF] managed to engage a decent number of citizens from a range of perspectives and maintain their engagement'. He felt this was a key strength as it enabled depth of discussion and 'gave the community the opportunity to become informed about the issue' without being pushed in any way.

This interviewee also identified that he and the organisation he represented for this interview liked the way the jury and speakers were engaged in the process,

> *'We liked that there was a process where they [the jury] could digest this information and then invite others they would like to hear from. It's all very open…liked the way the consultation and engagement happened. We came along and gave a talk and then got to engage with the groups individually. We got to get to depth of discussions through that process'.*

They gave particularly positive feedback on the selection of speakers, 'the ability of the jury to invite who they wanted to hear from makes it very open'. This interviewee couldn't think of any missing voices and thought it was a good representative cross section of the different views within the sector.

ii) Weaknesses

This interviewee couldn't identify any particular weaknesses and when asked if he had suggestions for improvements he responded, 'no, they ran it pretty well. Nothing comes to mind'. However, this interviewee did raise some questions about the deliberation aspect of the process, 'I don't know how they [the jury] took the information and made the final recommendations – that's just my curiosity'.

Professional organisations: value of the process going forward

This interviewee

This interviewee felt that the CPJ is a useful process and that 'the concept is an interesting one that relies on the collective wisdom of the community'. They also noted the value of other community engagement methods and the need to weigh up the costs and benefits of these different approaches.

> *'There are a number of different engagement methods. You need to weigh up the cost of this versus others. But this is certainly an approach that gives you commitment from community that gives you depth to community thought and therefore robust outcomes.'*

This interviewee was 'pretty confident' with the results of the process. They commented that 'these issues get so charged with agendas and I saw this approach as enabling citizens to look at the issue free of those charged opinions/agendas'. They found the recommendations 'quite rational' and believes that 'the council and state government will give them due consideration'.

6 **SUGGESTIONS FROM INTERVIEWEES**

This section contains a summary of process suggestions made by participants in the research.

Recommendations for improving future processes <u>from the interviewees</u>

Most interviewees had suggestions for improving the CPJ process. These are listed below. In some cases these were only identified when prompted about possible improvements to the process, and were not major concerns identified by interviewees. Where more than one interviewee suggested the same or similar suggestion this is identified.

Suggestions from interviewees related to **speakers** for the CPJ:

- Give more information to speakers, including about how speakers were selected, how it was determined how long each speaker would speak for, how the jury was supported in selecting speakers.
- Invite speakers in for conversation when drafting the recommendations as required.
- Allow more time for speakers to respond to a request to address the jury (so that more speakers are available).
- Provide more time for speakers to address the jury. For example, as one interviewee expressed 'I heard from others who had been at some of the sessions and who had spoken to the jury that they had others ideas that they didn't have an opportunity to explore or put it'. That is, the speakers did not have sufficient time to convey all of their ideas to the jury.

Suggestions from interviewees related to **participants** in the CPJ:

- Greater representation from resident groups/people affected.
- A couple of people felt a need for greater transparency in general and specifically around the recruitment process, including how the final jurors were selected, and around the selection process of speakers, particularly those who first addressed the jury.[11]
- Involve informed local residents (either on the jury or as a speaker).
- Incorporate minority voices.

Suggestions from interviewees related to **the process of developing recommendations:**

- A couple of people suggested testing the recommendations on someone other than the jury themselves. For example, one interviewee stated

---

[11] To be clear on this process, the first speakers were from the sponsoring organisations (NSW Government and City of Sydney) and the jurors determined the order of other speakers.

> '*it would have been good if the speakers had the opportunity to see the draft recommendations and provide feedback to the jury before they were finalised'*.

Another felt that it was important for stakeholders to be involved in workshopping the recommendations before they become policy to make sure they are 'realistic and affordable'.

- Allow more time for innovation to come through in the recommendations.

Suggestions from interviewees related to **policy impact:**

- The jury should be held early on in the policy development process to ensure maximum opportunities for impact of the recommendations.
- Focusing use of these processes in policy areas where government doesn't already have a strong policy position because as one interview suggested, 'if it [the recommendation report] comes out against a firm position it would be difficult and if it aligns there would be a perception issue – people wouldn't trust it'.

Suggestions from interviewees related to **communications and reputation**:

- Build the profile of nDF. As one interviewee noted, 'nDF needs to raise its profile so that it becomes part of more broad and mainstream policy development'. This interviewee shared ideas for doing this including aligning nDF with other reputable well-known research bodies, 'aligning them [nDF] with a university would help because people will pay more attention to them'. They identified the Menzies Research Centre, the Centre for Independent Studies and the McKell Institute as 'reputable think tanks'.
- Greater arms length from Council

Suggestions from interviewees related to **process and venue**:

- One interviewee suggested always adding an experiential component to the process, like the tour in this case. Though another noted that if a tour is to be conducted in future processes that industry should be engaged in designing this component.
- Ensure consistent venue locations. One interviewee observed an inconsistency in venue location, and felt a consistent venue for the jury to meet is important.

7 **DISCUSSION**

Overall the majority of interviewees support the process as a useful policy making tool, and felt that it was carried out effectively in this instance. Interviewees who support the Citizen Policy Jury's as a useful tool and had suggestions for improving the process in future, made suggestions related to transparency, accountability and communications. Many of the features of the current process were seen as very strong and favourable – including the opportunity to have diverse, high profile speakers address the participants, the opportunity for groups to make a submission, the option for people to observe the proceedings and the diversity and selection process of participants. For those who see value in this type of process going forward, there were no serious reservations about how the process ran; however they did have ideas about how communications could be improved at certain stages of the process in future.

For those who did not see the value in this type of process going forward, they felt that stakeholders should have a stronger input and that local groups with residents who have first hand experience of the issue under consideration should have a stronger voice in processes like this. Some expressed a general distrust in the government, which appeared to significantly influence their perception of this CPJ.

Broad support for the process across different types of organisations

There were many aspects of the CPJ process which were considered favourably by interviewees – the novel approach to bringing citizens together to deeply work through an issue, the diversity of speakers, the site visit to affected areas, the fact that any organisation or individual could make a submission.

Similar stakeholder groups had different opinions

It was difficult to determine a consistent view from each stakeholder group category – where we interviewed multiple organisations of the same stakeholder type, there were variations in their perspectives of the Jury – it's usefulness, it's value as a mechanism for engaging citizens, and in it's recommendations.

Local groups emphasised the role of local perspectives in decision-making

In terms of engaging communities in decision making, 'community' can refer to people brought together due to shared characteristics, beliefs, geographical proximity, or interests - either face-to-face or remotely (Fritze, Williamson & Wiseman 2009). Many government organisations now define community to include a much broader suite of stakeholders then residents alone (e.g. City of Holdfast Bay 2010, Latrobe City 2005). For example Latrobe City (2005) speaks of "all citizens, ratepayers, landowners and members of the general public (including all individuals, groups, organisations, government, industry and business) who have a stake and interest in the municipality".

However what this broad approach to defining community, and the inclusive approach to stakeholder identification for decision making that goes with it, means for organisations

who are place based and are lobbying on an issue which is perceived by them to be primarily a place-based issue, remains to be seen. When local groups see residents of a geographical area as the primary stakeholders for an issue, how do they react to a process that involves many voices, and in which local residents may not be the primary voice? Are there forms of local knowledge that are *necessary* (rather than optional) to be shared with other stakeholders, if decision making is to be informed? Or is a group of varied citizens, presented with written information from local groups able to make an informed decision to not hear more about these perspectives – *and still* arrive at an informed decision?

Some interviewees felt that local groups should have had a stronger voice within the CPJ – either by more membership of residents in the Jury, or by more speakers. Others suggested that in applying these kinds of processes going forward they should be accompanied by other consultative processes that allow for other (local) voices to also be heard strongly.

If any step—determining who participates, how they deliberate, what information will be provided and by whom, how decisions will be made and the influence they will have—is judged to be insufficiently equitable by any of those involved or affected by the deliberation, the whole process tends to fall into disrepute. (Hartz-Karp, 2007, p.18).

Some appeared to reject the recommendations based on process; others rejected the process based on recommendations

As described earlier, the two interviewees who were most critical of the recommendations expressed significant dissatisfaction. One had the perception that the speakers were invited by the CoS and this had led to questionable results. As Hartz-Karp suggests *….producing both the experience and the perception of an egalitarian process is far from simple. Despite attempts to include the key antagonists, protagonists, professional experts, and non-aligned community members throughout the process, the perceptions of different parties concerning what constitutes equity do not always align.* (Hartz-Karp, 2007, p.18).

The other felt that the recommendations were too diverse and did not address the actual problem [which in their opinion was alcohol provision and licensing]. They felt there was an issue with 'how the problem was framed…it steered the conversation and recommendations away from the actual issue of violence at night'. They also felt the recommendations demonstrated that 'this group was not given enough information to address the particular issues'. As Hartz-Karp also suggests from WA experience: *when deliberation outcomes have not supported the strongly-held views of any of the parties, the process is apt to be blamed and its legitimacy questioned or lost* (Hartz-Karp, 2007, p.18). Two contextual factors to note here (which were identified in section 1) are that:

- The issue had been framed in a positive way so as to mirror the framing of the South Australian CPJ.
- 2 days before the CPJ started the state government made some licensing decisions – this skewed what the participants looked at because they felt that the

issue of licensing had already been addressed and so decided not to deal with this issue in detail in their recommendations.

The research raises questions about the role of individuals speaking on behalf of groups

While the research looked at the views of stakeholder groups, the interviews were with individuals. The individuals interviewed may have been vested with the authority of their group to represent the views of all members, or may not. The views they expressed may have been shared by all members of their organisation, or may not. The world-views and characteristics of the individuals interviewed may have also played a role in their response to the CPJ, in addition to their organisations' stated stance or policy position.

In particular this research suggests that world-views or political views regarding the trustworthiness of government appeared to influence the views of some participants. In some cases concern with the process was linked to a strongly personal sense of distrust in government, rather than the details of either the process conducted or the recommendations resulting. This may be another key influence as well as the type of group an individual is participating in, as a predictor of their response to a process such as a CPJ. Research shows that citizens' political tolerance (tolerance for others to engage in political activities) is influenced strongly by the depth of their commitment to democratic values, by their personality, and by the degree to which they perceive others as threatening (Sullivan and Transue 1999). Similarly past negative experience with a submissions process or a public participation process on the same topic that has been seen to have unsatisfactory outcomes appeared to influence negativity towards this specific Jury process.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

This section contains recommendations from the authors of this research.

Recommendations for improving future processes <u>from the authors of this report</u>

Many of these recommendations are about communications rather than fundamental changes to the CPJ process. While these actions may take time and have a cost attached to them, we feel they could increase the reach of the project and help build trust in such processes more broadly.

Involve stakeholders in framing the issues

A stakeholder advisory group could be involved in helping to frame the issue and select the wording to be used. The framing of the Policy Jury, which was used in this instance ('Safe and Vibrant Night Life'), is broadly consistent with the advice on value-based framing provided by Common Cause (Crompton, 2010; Holmes et al, 2011). Common Cause (see also http://valuesandframes.org) draws attention to the ways in which particular communication frames can trigger and reinforce particular values. It recommends the use of frames that trigger intrinsic values that are inherently rewarding to pursue, rather than extrinsic values that are centred on external approval or rewards. In this case, the emphasis on a safe and vibrant nightlife is positive, inclusive and intrinsic. Alternative framings that emphasise alcohol use or violence would trigger extrinsic values such as hedonism and security, which can reinforce those values and lead to more selfish, less creative problem solving. Involving stakeholders in discussions about the framing could help make this process more transparent and help stakeholders to feel ownership of the framing.

Consider a role for stakeholders in process design and oversight – for example establish a Stakeholder advisory group

A stakeholder advisory group could be established to oversee the design and implementation of the Jury. This group could play a role similar to a 'steering committee' or 'reference group' - reviewing key design decisions, reviewing processes used in the Jury, and providing a flow of information between the process and their constituents.

The benefits of this type of group are outlined in (Kahane, Lopston, Herriman and Hardy 2013), however they rely on actively engaged stakeholder groups wiling to invest time in scrutinising *process* rather than contributing *content*, which may be unfamiliar and uncomfortable for some. While this could help raise profile for the Jury and stakeholder confidence in the process, it will not mean that all stakeholders agree with this approach or the role being offered to them.

A greater degree of buy-in and public legitimacy for citizen deliberations can be secured by involving stakeholders in prominent supporting roles. One version of this—used quite commonly with high-profile government-convened citizen deliberations—involves assembling an advisory committee of stakeholders. Members of such an advisory

committee allow their organizations to be associated with the exercise, and are consulted on briefing materials as well as process design. This can increase the comfort level of stakeholders with the exercise, and thus perhaps with citizen recommendations; it also enables conveners to point to stakeholder approval of briefing materials and process, making it more difficult for the legitimacy of the citizen deliberation process to be undermined by stakeholders displeased with recommendations. (Kahane, Lopston, Herriman and Hardy 2013).

Clarify roles of sponsoring organisations/ government agencies in communicating about the Jury

Interviewees suggested that communication about the project at the beginning of the project could have been stronger from the state and local government organisations involved. We understand this relates to a 'trade off' or possible tension between having on the one hand, a degree of separation from the detail of the process by government which can positively contribute to perceived integrity of the process; and on the other hand the reality that these organisations have strong 'brand' power and existing networks who might expect to hear about the process through them. Finding ways to use existing networks and communications channels of partnering organizations may mean that already engaged stakeholders are kept aware of the process.

Ensure the call for submissions is widespread, systematic and transparent

There is some evidence that in this Citizens Policy Jury some relevant organisations were not directly invited to make a submission.

Submissions were invited through several parallel processes: through CoS and nDF directly inviting groups to make a submission, and through an open invitation on the website. We recommend that there be some stakeholder mapping at the start of the project and all groups listed on this map with an interest in the topic area (spanning Hendrick's categories of groups) be sent information about the process and an invitation to make a submission. This communication material should clarify that this is a very important stage in the process, and may be the group's only way to input to the Jury. This could be sent either through the sponsoring organisation or nDF.

We note that if there are a large number of submissions, this content may have to be managed in some way for the participants, or greater time given to participants to review this material.

Keep groups who make a submission up to date through the life of the project

We also suggest that all submissions made by groups be acknowledged in writing, with thanks, and that further information be provided about how they can get involved (e.g. As an observer, or stay tuned for results on date X, or would you like to be on our stakeholder advisory group or similar, check in on the website for updates).

A few periodic updates to these stakeholders who made submissions could be used through the process – to build trust and keep the process high profile. For example these updates could be timed to coincide with the following project milestones:

- An update on the range of submissions received and how these will be used
- An update once participants have been recruited, communicating the demographics of the group
- An update once the speakers have been chosen and
- An update once the recommendations have been drafted and are planned for public release

To make the most of this 'newsletter' style project update, a number of additional stakeholders beyond those who made a submission could be included – for example government staff involved in the project.

Establish clear channels for feedback
Invite feedback on the process through the life of the process, clearly on the website.

Profile the jurors
While respecting anonymity it will be important to profile the diversity of the jurors and the number that are younger, older, who live within the City centre – etc. This would be a good point of communication about the project to include in communications to stakeholders above.

Ensure a clear narrative around role of stakeholders in decision-making
Maintain respectful communications about the role of stakeholders in decision-making, within a CPJ process, and the important role they play as submission makers and potentially as speakers.

Support the process of developing recommendations within the Jury
Within the event, build in reflection time for prioritising and creative ideas within the recommendation making process. Use of 'Design-thinking' tools for generating creative new solutions could be trialed.

Give draft recommendations to stakeholder advisory group (or speakers) for feedback
This would allow for checking of feasibility, identification of ideas that duplicate with others etc. The Jurors would then deliberate on the feedback and any changes they may wish to make – but they would not be coerced by stakeholders into doing so.

Make the decision making micro process more clear
In answer to the question 'How are decisions made 'behind closed doors' during the deliberation?' NDF could illuminate this process in two useful ways:

- Make a short documentary for the website that features vox pops with actual participants and explains what they are doing and how they are reaching recommendations (this would be used as an information resource for all juries to follow – for speakers, potential participants, potential funders etc)
- Make a short 1-2 page document that outlines how decision-making takes place: consensus/ voting/ prioritising/ feasibility checking etc.

This is important because the quality of deliberations may influence the quality of recommendations. Several stakeholders were interested to learn more about how exactly a room of people are guided through a deliberation to generate ideas and agree on ideas as presented in recommendations.

Testimonials

In general the website could also feature testimonials about the process from participants and speakers, to help build credibility and reputation.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CONSULTATION PROCESSES, OF WHICH A CPJ MAY BE A PART

Establishing parallel stakeholder processes

Another option for future processes is to consider processes in which stakeholder inputs and CPJ inputs are seen as parallel inputs to a decision making process. We recognize that this 'waters down' the impact of the CPJ in shaping policy, and (as with current consultative processes) leaves decision makers in the situation of having to weigh up multiple sources of data on preferences. Engaging in more traditional stakeholder consultations also may result in existing power structures and vested interests influencing decision-making, in the way that 'citizen' mini-public processes seek to avoid.

9 **CONCLUSIONS**

This research suggests that the CPJ was supported by a wide range of stakeholder groups, with mixed levels of participation in the process.

This research suggests that world-views or political views regarding the trustworthiness of government appeared to influence the views of some participants. Similarly past negative experience with a submissions process or a public participation process on the same topic that has been seen to have unsatisfactory outcomes appeared to influence negativity towards this specific Jury process.

In some cases views seem strongly aligned to group identity – some local groups felt that local voices were left out or under represented in the process, and therefore showed little confidence in the overall Jury approach or their capacity to generate useful outcomes. These local groups seemed inclined to not support the outcomes *in principle* based on process details related to recruitment and speaker selection rather than due to any detailed concerns about the specifics of the recommendations.

Others seemed to support or not support the outcomes based more on the content of the recommendations than the rigour of the process. Those who had no in-principle concerns with the design of the process *and also* felt the recommendations were reasonable appeared to **generally support the CPJ approach to citizen engagement in decision making.** In contrast, those who felt the recommendations missed key issues that were important to their group did **not generally support the CPJ approach to citizen engagement in decision-making.**

A key issue to explore further is to what degree would the group see value in the process if the results were aligned with their group's stated policy positions or aims/ or were not aligned with their aims. This could be investigated by conducting research before, during and after a CPJ event was conducted.

Providing more information about certain stages of the process, providing follow up information to those briefed on the project or who make submissions, and clarifying the role of partner organisations in promoting the event and seeking submissions could be useful additions to future processes.

Support for the process appeared to grow as individual's experience and familiarity with the process grew. So inviting key stakeholders to be observers of processes, to build their familiarity, could be an effective strategy to increase general support for such processes.

10 REFERENCES

Costello L.N. and Dunn K. 1994; Resident action groups in Sydney: people power or rat-bags? Australian Geographer 25(1): 61-76.

Crompton, T 2010, Common cause: The case for working with our cultural values, WWF-UK.

Fritze, J., Williamson, L. & Wiseman, J. 2009, Community engagement and climate change: benefits, challenges and strategies, Department of Planning and Community Development, Victorian Government.

Halvorsen, K. E. 2006, 'Critical next steps in research on public meetings and environmental decision making', Human Ecology Review, 13(2): 150-60.

Hendricks, C.M., 2011, The Politics of Public Deliberation: Citizen Engagement and Interest Advocacy, Palgrave Macmillan, UK.

Holmes, T, Blackmore, E, Hawkins, R & Wakeford, T 2011, The Common Cause Handbook, Public Interest Research Centre.

Kahane, David; Loptson, Kristjana; Herriman, Jade; and Hardy, Max (2013) "Stakeholder and Citizen Roles in Public Deliberation," *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 9: Iss. 2, Article 2. Available at: http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol9/iss2/art2

Latrobe City Council 2005, Community engagement policy and strategy, Second revised edition, Latrobe City Council.

Mackenzie, M. & Warren, M.E., 2012. Two Trust-Based Uses of Minipublics in Democratic Systems. In Parkinson, J. & Mansbridge, J, *Deliberative Systems*, Cambridge University Press

Sullivan J. L. and TransueJ. E. (1999) 'The psychological underpinnings of Democracy: A Selective Review of Research on Political Tolerance, Interpersonal Trust, and Social Capital. Annual Review of Psychology Vol. 50: 625-650 (February 1999).

Welch, Hinnant and Moon, Linking Citizen Satisfaction with E-Government and Trust in Government J Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. 15(3): 371-391. doi: 10.1093/jopart/mui02

Hatz-Karp, J. 2007, 'Understanding deliberativeness: bridging theory and practice', International Journal for Public Participation, 1(2)

<http://www.iap2.org.au/sitebuilder/resources/knowledge/asset/files/31/journal_issue2_ha
rtzkarp.pdf>

STAKEHOLDER PERCEPTIONS OF DELIBERATIVE
DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

11 APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 - PROCESS SUMMARY OF THE CITIZEN POLICY JURY: DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

The following details have been provided by nDF.

In August 2013 nDF were retained by the City of Sydney for a citizen's jury process supported and co-funded by the Premier's office on the topic of *"How can we ensure a safe and vibrant nightlife for Sydney?"*

Recruitment

- Participants were randomly invited to participate as a means of securing a representative sample of the community. The Australia Post database was used to generate random addresses within defined areas, which are set out in the Project Design document (attached).
- Invitations for the Citizens' Policy Jury were issued to 20,000 citizens randomly drawn from across metropolitan Sydney, complemented by an additional random draw from University of Sydney students to maximise the response rate in the 18-24 category.
- Invitations came from the Lord Mayor of the City of Sydney and noted the commitment of the Premier to have the final report tabled in Parliament.
- This sample was then invited to register electronically with nDF to indicate whether they would be available for the final selection.
- From the positive responses, a sample was drawn electronically based on the pre-agreed stratification goals. The aim was to achieve a group descriptively representative of the community even if one subset of the community responded disproportionately to the initial invitation. The jury was chosen to include people not representing any political party, lobbyists or interest groups, ensuring a mix (matched to the census data) of age and gender.
- The sample (which incorporated a number of reserves) were sent a comprehensive schedule and explanatory kit of pre-reading (an online private forum with a library of documents and submissions), with a request of the citizen to provide a final acceptance allowing nDF to finalise the panels.
- 43 participants were recruited in total.

Submission process

- Opportunity advertised on City of Sydney's website and lodged via email to New Democracy by Friday 24 January 2014. However there was a note to say that submissions received after this date would be accepted. See the end of this Appendix 1 for the list of submissions received by the Citizen's Jury.

- City of Sydney were encouraged to notify known advocacy groups.

The Jury

- The Jury met five times over 3 months for full-day meetings.
    - Saturday **February 1st** – Sydney Town Hall (Vestibule Room)
    - Saturday **February 22nd** – Novotel Darling Harbour, 100 Murray St Pyrmont
    - Saturday **March 8th** - Novotel Darling Harbour, 100 Murray St Pyrmont
    - Saturday **March 22nd** - Novotel Darling Harbour, 100 Murray St Pyrmont
    - Saturday **April 5th** – Sydney Town Hall.

- Prior to the Jury's first meeting, a set of background documents was circulated to the jurors. This formed the baseline content for deliberation.
- At the jury's first all day meeting they read the submissions and heard from Mandy Young at Department of Premier's Cabinet and Suzie Matthews at City of Sydney. Based on the information considered to that point, the jury identified particular experts and technical views for their consideration at their next meeting.
- nDF then called these speakers to invite them to speak and give a short briefing to the Jury.
- The second meeting of the Jury involved a 2 hour session which gave each of the seven presenters (see attached agenda) a 5-7 minute window to make an opening statement about what jurors should consider at this early stage of their deliberations. A short panel discussion followed, before the participants spent 10 minutes per table in a small conversational environment, each with 6 jurors at a table (this size group was chosen to allow the greatest opportunity for questions and inquiry).
- Councillors were invited to be involved via the following options:
    - Spend time with a table of 6 jurors conveying their experiences, their views and the views of the community who contact them so they can directly share this with jurors. This is then repeated to allow a number of small groups to have the same experience in the 75 minute session.
    - Take and observer role: come along and see them in person, hear the questions they ask and see how they work together.
    - Participate in informal discussion during morning tea breaks.
- An 80% supermajority was required for a final decision from the jury – to be included in the recommendations.

List of speakers that addressed the Jury

1. Dr Peter Aqulina, Australian Medical Association
2. Nicholas Cowdrey, QC (previous Director of Public Prosecutions)
3. Jackie Fitzgerald, Deputy Director, Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research
4. Caterina Georgi, Director of Policy and Research, Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education
5. Dr Garry Glazebrook, Transport Economist and Urban Planner, UTS
6. Dr Gordian Fulde, Head of the Emergency Department, St Vincents Hospital in

7.   John Green, Director Policing and Regulations, Australian Hotels Association

8.   A/Superintendent Kelly Kortlepel, Acting Commander of the Drug and Alcohol Command

9.   Danielle Matsuo, Director Sex and Violent Offender Therapeutic Programs, Corrective Services NSW

10.   Suzie Matthews, Manager of City Business and Safety, City of Sydney Council

11.   Paul Newson, Executive Director, Office of Liquor Gaming and Racing

12.   Brian Smyth King, Executive Director, Learning and Engagement NSW Education

13.   Fran O'Brien, Manager Economic Strategy, City of Sydney

14.   Tim Reardon, Deputy Director General, Policy and Strategy, Transport NSW

15.   John Wall, Director, Fuzzy (events promoter)

16.   Mark Walton, Local Area Commander, George Street, NSW Police

17.   Rodger Watson, Deputy Director of Designing Out Crime Research Centre, UTS

18.   Mandy Young, Department of Premier and Cabinet

List of submissions received by the Citizen's Jury

19.   C. Hiller

20.   S. Thomson

21.   B. Adams, Surry Hills Business Alliance

22.   N. Glenn

23.   J Fletcher

24.   R. Bain

25.   S. Thavaratnam

26.   R. Hoffman

27.   Associate Professor Brian Owler, Australian Medical Association

28.   L. Fairbrother

29.   M. Ossner

30.   B. James

31.   O. Hamidi

32.   S. Jarnason

33.   P. Young

34.   Office of the Premier

35.   City of Sydney Council (Suzie Matthews)

36.   Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education

37.   Councillor Linda Scott

38.   NSW Taxi Council

39.   NSW / ACT Alcohol Policy Alliance

40.   P. McGrath

41.   S. O'Riordan

42.   S. Mahmood

43.   J. Marks

44.   Councillor Jenny Green
45.   Thomas Kelly Youth Foundation
46.   NSW Police, Central Metropolitan Region Commander
47.   Australian Hotels Association
48.   National Live Music Office
49.   R. Wright
50.   S. Lifschitz
51.   D. Gallard
52.   Lord Mayoral Minute
53.   D. Matsuo, Corrective Services
54.   Premier of NSW
55.   M. Walton, NSW Police
56.   C. Koon
57.   City of Sydney Council

APPENDIX 2 - SPEAKER REQUESTS MADE BY PARTICIPANTS IN THE CITIZENS' POLICY JURY – SAFE AND VIBRANT NIGHTLIFE FOR SYDNEY

The following details have been provided by nDF.

Jurors Information Request Sheets – Meeting 1

Speaker Requests – Common across multiple tables (each <u>column</u> represents a table's response sheet)

Police: local commanders, foot police			Ex-Police Commissioner	Police (how they manage potentially violent people)	Police re: situation in Kings Cross & the Rocks (+ attitudes of police to public and vice-a-versa)	Police (Kings Cross – how do they manage issues without confrontation)
Don Weatherburn, Bureau of Criminology	Don Weatherburn	Don Weatherburn		Don Weatherburn	Crime statistician	
Transport: Minister, Trains, Taxis				Someone from Sydney buses/trains	Taxi Council Transport NSW (current state of play)	Taxis (change-over times, short fares, safety in taxis)
Medical: St Vincent's Emergency Surgeons	Brian Owler				Brian Owler (stats) Alcohol researcher / doctor	Brian Owler
Club / hotel owners / publicans	Hotel Association	Hotel Association (what is impact of new regulations)	*Expert on night time economy* from Pablo Alverez	Hotel / business manager (how their staff deal with RSA		

				issues; how new laws will effect them)		
Psychologist: Jamison (put in submission)	Sociologist (Eva Cox)	Criminal psychologist (shed light on alcohol's effect on behaviour) Sociologist (discuss cultural change required and related strategies needed to make successful)			Behavioural psychologist Expert on cultural change	Cultural change (from binge drinking & violent culture)
Lawyers: on implications of NSW Govt changes			Ex-DPP (Nicholas Chowdry)		Bar Association	
Education Minister (re: education / attitudes toward Police)					Education Dept (drug & alcohol prevention programs, anger management, drugs & alcohol in sport)	Role of ethics classes in schools Frustration / anger management
	Urban Planner (how to reinvent a space)		Town Planner (effective town planning – impact on anti-social behaviour; Melbourne City)		Minister or Premier	
FARE (on their 10 point plan & r/ship to Govt initiatives)	FARE					

Speaker Requests – non-replicated suggestions - for consideration at Meeting #2 for speakers at Meeting #3

Victims' families	Security Industry body	Licensing Board (impact of temporary licenses; process of issuing licenses)	Rep from Salvation Army re: rehabilitation (Oasis Centre)	Marketing dept (powerful advertising campaign)	Media: positive messages, street smart info
Offenders (just participants in fights)	Promoters/advertisers for City of Sydney/event manager		Gabriella Gomez-Mont or someone who can comment on 'Laboratorio Para la Ciudad' Mexico city's creative think tank and environmental space, which "ponders social scripts & urban futures"	Academics rather than politicians	

Information only requests

Profiling of offenders Impact on hospitals, policy, local govt, state govt (costs)	Treasury costings: Police, Transport	Where are offenders and victims of ARC from?	Busking licenses	How many use night rider buses	Data from Emergency Services eg ambulance & ER St Vincent's & Sydney Hospitals – stats on alcohol & drug related	Longitudinal data on alcohol related violence
Access to raw statistics	Info on Newcastle experiment			Crime stats	Crime stats	Difference b/w alcohol laws: Sydney v NSW
Allen Report (?)	Licensing Act				NSW Transport – 24 hours	Drug & alcohol use
Foot Traffic stats	Individual residents' accounts				Taxis – change over time	Successful strategies overseas (What has Barcelona done?)
Impact on hospitals, policy, local govt, state govt (costs)					Newcastle businesses – what is effect on businesses e.g. numbers going out	
					Minister / Premier – why are they going by current ideas / stats (??)	

APPENDIX 3 – AGENDAS FOR EACH CITIZEN'S POLICY JURY MEETING

new DEMOCRACY

City of Sydney Citizens' Policy Jury – Agenda for Day 1

February 1st 2014

9:30	Welcome & formal opening
9:50	Jury purpose and overview
10:45	Morning tea
11:00	Participant hopes and fears Group working principles
12:00	Unpacking the Jury Remit
1:00	Lunch
1:30	Issues Snapshot – Technical Presentation #1
2:00	Critical Thinking Exercise
2:30	Issues Snapshot – Technical Presentation #2
3:10	Information reflection, information requirements, future speakers.
4:00	Admin: late night tour, online discussion, media.
4:30	Close of Day One

newDEMOCRACY

Citizens' Policy Jury – Agenda for Day 2

February 22nd 2014

9:30	Opening & reflection on Night-time Tour experiences
10:00	Technical session #1: AMA – Dr Peter Aquilina
10:45	Morning tea
11:00	Common understanding
11:30	Elected representatives Q&A with jurors
12:15	Technical session #2: BOCSAR (Bureau of Crime Statistics & Research) – Jackie Fitzgerald (Deputy Director, BOCSAR)
1:00	Lunch
1:30	Interactive Technical Panel 5 minutes per speaker opening message (35-40 mins) 10 minutes per table speaker by speaker interaction (70-80 minutes) i. AHA – John Green, Director of Policing & Regulations ii. Lawyer, ex-DPP – Nick Cowdery QC iii. City of Sydney Town Planner – Fran O'Brien, Manager Economic Strategy, City of Sydney iv. FARE – Caterina Georgi, Director of Policy and Research v. NSW Police - Acting Superintendent Kelly Kortlepel, Acting Commander of the Drug and Alcohol Command vi. Transport for NSW – Tim Reardon, Deputy Director General, Policy and Strategy vii. NSW Education - Brian Smyth King, Executive Director, Learning and Engagement
3:30	Afternoon tea
3:40	Summarise and synthesize: key learnings and themes Select speakers for meeting #3
4:20	Evaluation and administration.
4:30	Close of Day One

newDEMOCRACY

Citizens' Policy Jury –Agenda for Day 3

March 8th 2014

9:30	Welcome, review agenda and process
10:00	Explore process opportunities
10:45	Morning tea
11:00	Interactive Technical Panel 5 minutes per speaker opening message (35-40 mins) 10 minutes per table speaker by speaker interaction (50-60 minutes) • Security of physical space – Rodger Watson, Deputy Director of Designing Out Crime Research Centre at UTS • Local police commander for George Street – Mark Walton, Superintendent Commander City of Sydney Local Area Command • Criminal psychologist – Danielle Matsuo, Director Sex and Violent Offender Therapeutic Programs for the NSW Dept of Corrective Services • Transport Economist – Garry Glazebrook, (consultant to multiple levels of government) • Event and festival promoter – John Wall, Director, Fuzzy (HarbourLife, Field Day, Shore Thing)
12:30	Process roadmap
1:00	Lunch
1:30	Small group discussion
1:45	Technical presentation on behalf of Minister Souris by Paul Newson, Executive Director, Office of Liquor Gaming and Racing
2.45	Small group discussion
3:30	Afternoon tea
3:45	Small group discussion
4:20	Evaluation and next meeting
4:30	Close of Day Three

newDEMOCRACY

Citizens' Policy Jury – Agenda for Day 4

March 22nd 2014

9:30	Welcome and introductions
9:45	Report format and process for report
10:15	Synthesising thinking on desired outcomes – group work
10:45	Morning tea
11:00	Synthesising thinking on desired outcomes – group work
1:00	Lunch
1:30	Synthesising thinking on desired outcomes – group work
2.00	Refining recommendations – group work
3:30	Afternoon tea
3:45	Refining recommendations – group work
4:20	Evaluation and next steps
4:30	Close of Day One