

Annex A. Overview of existing principles

There are a great number of existing principles and standards for citizen participation generally. 5, however, focuses on principles and standards for deliberative processes for public decision making in particular. The following list of principles or standards for deliberative engagement existed when the collaborative work for developing the OECD principles began in September 2019:

- Jefferson Centre: *Citizens' Jury Handbook* (2004)
- Involve: *Deliberative Public Engagement: Nine Principles* (2008)
- Mosaic Lab: *Deliberative Engagement Principles* (2016)
- newDemocracy Foundation: R&D notes about 'How to do it?' (2017-2018) and 5 Principles
- MASS LBP: *How to Run a Civic Lottery* (2017) and *How to Commission a Citizens' Assembly or Reference Panel* (2019)
- Marcin Gerwin: *Guidelines and Basic Standards for Organising Citizens' Assemblies* (2018)
- Healthy Democracy: *Key Quality Elements of the Citizens' Initiative Review* (2018)
- David Farrell *et al.*: *Deliberative Mini-Publics: Core Design Features* (2019)

Comparing existing principles

In Table A.A.1, the OECD has identified the commonalities and differences of the existing principles documents.

Table A A.1. Comparison of existing principles of good practice for deliberative processes: commonalities and differences

Principles, as written in existing documents	Jefferson Centre: Citizens Jury Handbook (2004)	Involve: Deliberative Public Engagement: Nine Principles (2008)	Mosaic Lab: Deliberative Engagement Principles (2016)	newDemocracy Foundation: R&D notes about how to do it? (2017-2018)	MASS LBP: How to run a civic lottery (2017) and How to commission a Citizens Assembly or Reference Panel (2019)	Marcin Gerwin: Basic standards for organising citizens assemblies (2018)	Healthy Democracy: Key Quality Elements of the Citizens Initiative Review (2018)	David Farrell <i>et al.</i> : Deliberative Mini-Publics: Core Design Features (2019)
Purpose and mandate								
Participants have an explicit mandate to advise public authorities on issues that typically require trade-offs or compromises		X		X	X	X		
Process is tailored to the circumstances: purpose and objectives; intended outcomes; the people who should be involved; the context		X						X
The task or remit of the deliberative process is neither too broad nor too narrow	X				X			
Deliberation is suitable when a range of people and/or groups must act in order for the community to move		X		X				

forward								
The task or remit is in a clear, plain language and provides a strong and open platform for discussion about trade-offs			X					
Public deliberation is appropriate if broad concern exists within a community; citizens have not had the opportunity to consider the different courses of action and their long-term consequences; and the decision-making of public leaders needs to be informed by public judgement, as well as experts views				X				
A mandate typically has three responsibilities: to learn about the issue; to consider various perspectives concerning the issue; and to reach consensus and provide detailed recommendations concerning the best resolution of the issue					X			
Participants are tasked with understanding and speaking for the needs of their community, even when they differ from their own concerns or preferences					X			

The participants can go beyond the task or remit, but must provide detailed reasons for doing so	X							
Random selection								
Random selection of participants	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Representativeness: composition should match demographic profile of the community; aim is to create a community in small scale that feels like us	X		X	X		X	X	X
Diversity and inclusiveness: efforts made to involve diversity of people, people from marginalized or seldom-heard groups		X		X				X
Preventing exclusion: could entail incentives to participate such as remuneration, expenses or childcare	X	X				X	X	
Equality: a sense that everyone has an equal shot of being selected to participate						X	X	X

Participants are less open to influence from special interests (especially wealthier and more powerful ones) and are representing the broader public interest				X	X			
The panelist selection process is monitored by a neutral party							X	
Independent organisation								
There might be an advisory committee/board with individuals who are knowledgeable about the issue and represent a variety of perspectives and opinions; the interest of the committee is in the integrity and fairness of the process, not in any specific outcome	X			X	X		X	X
Independent coordination by impartial secretariat or organisation which prepares the random selection, develops the agenda, invites facilitators and experts				X	X	X	X	X
The process should be led by a professional team with specialised expertise in dialogue, group work				X	X	X	X	

and consensus-building								
Learning, expertise and evidence								
Possibility for participants to gain information and weigh evidence	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Impartiality: any organization, informal group or institution has the right to submit evidence	X		X	X		X	X	X
Participants are able to engage the experts/stakeholders in a dialogue to guarantee questions have been answered	X	X		X		X	X	X
There is guidance for choosing experts to ensure a diversity of perspectives / balance	X			X		X		X
Openness: members of society should be able to provide inputs (comments, proposals or suggestions) / there should be wider engagement with members of the public				X	X	X		X
Learning phase ensures that each participant shares a common			X	X	X	X		

understanding of the process, relevant context, and subject matter expertise to make informed recommendations								
Possibility for participants to invite experts / to identify experts that they wish to hear from				X		X		
Training or practice of critical thinking must be embedded in deliberative processes. Participants must make a transition from the individual practice of critical thinking to a collaborative inquiry or critical engagement				X				
Guidelines are provided to experts to encourage them to use language that is not saturated in academic jargon, acronyms, or similar				X		X		
Participants spend almost half of their time learning about the topic					X			
Deliberation								
Discussions which include listening to others mindfully	X	X	X	X	X	X		X

Mix of small group and plenary discussions; variety of formats (change of rhythm; size of small groups, get people moving, take into account different learning styles, quiet time for individual reflection)	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Discussions should be moderated by professional skilled facilitators	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Exercise follows a path of learning, deliberation and drafting recommendations		X	X	X	X	X		X
Duration								
Sufficient time for reflection and ability to prolong the length or number of meetings if necessary				X		X		
Adequate time for deliberation (but not too long that it results in members becoming overly socialized or affecting the equality of opportunity to participate*)	X							X*
Participants invest at least forty or more					X			

hours								
Impact								
Linked to the policy process: clear guidelines for how the body commissioning a deliberative process should deal with the recommendations		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Participants strive to reach consensus on a series of detailed recommendations	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Recommendations are in a language that the participants have themselves developed and approved	X		X	X	X		X	
Recommendations should be reflected in a public report to build a public understanding of the participants recommendations	X			X	X	X		X
Recommendations should be presented by participants publicly to the public officials; this can also be in presence of interested citizens and the press	X				X	X		

In addition to consensus recommendations, participants can write a minority report to convey concerns with the process or its conclusions, which are included in the final report				X	X			
Recommendations and the report should be presented to decision-makers directly			X					
Recommendations that receive the participants support at an agreed threshold should be treated as binding						X		
The Citizens Statement is distributed to reach the largest number of voters possible based on budget and access to communication outlets							X	
Transparency								
Transparency: all materials (programme, experts briefings, submissions by experts, interest groups and members of the public, audio recordings, transcripts of plenary sessions) should be available online		X		X		X		X

The participants final report, with details about the project and methodology, should be made available to the public	X			X		X	X	
Information is accessible to all participants, taking into account different literacy levels and languages, and disabilities such as restricted hearing or sight		X						
Visibility and public communication								
Visibility: publicity throughout the process; public announcement at the outset and communication of results	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Respect and harnessing civic energy								
Participants should be valued and respected: organisers should fulfill their duty of care to support participants; organisers and decision-makers should state commitment to take process seriously and respect participants	X	X		X	X	X		

contribution								
Participants are given clear information on the process before, during, between and after meetings, events and online initiatives		X		X		X	X	
Encouraging participants to stay in touch with each other after the event, giving participants information to help them stay involved through volunteering, campaigning or interest groups, and providing information about other participation initiatives		X						
Evaluation								
Process is reviewed and evaluated to assess what has been achieved and to improve future practice		X		X		X	X	
Participants are asked to complete an evaluation of the project (the process, parts of the agenda, project staff, perceptions of bias) and given an opportunity to write a personal statement	X			X			X	
The results of the participants	X							

evaluations are included in the final report								
The process is evaluated for fairness and efficacy							X	
When possible, the evaluation should be conducted by an independent academic research team to measure quality of deliberation and ensure absence of bias							X	
A plan is made to evaluate the success of distribution methods of the Citizens Statement, and resources permitting, to evaluate voter response on the usefulness of the Citizens Initiative Review							X	

Source: Jefferson Centre (2004); Involve (2008); Mosaic Lab (2016); newDemocracy Foundation (2017-18); MASS LBP (2017, 2019); Marcin Gerwin (2018); David Farrell *et al.* (2019); Healthy Democracy (2018)

Below is a descriptive summary of the principles that are found in all or almost all of the existing documents. In addition to the evidence collected and the principles and good practices it revealed, these principles provided a useful starting point for the development of the Good Practice Principles and the discussions with the international group of experts, public officials, and practitioners who provided important input into this process:

- purpose outlined in a clear task or remit to participants, which is linked to a defined public problem that involves the weighing of trade-offs;
- influence on public decisions through a clear link to the policy process, including guidelines for how the decision-making authority will respond to recommendations determined at the outset, wide use of voter information, internal implementation structures, or authority to sponsor popular referendums or directly enact policy;
- respect for the participants and a valuation of their time and efforts;
- representativeness of participants (a “microcosm of the general public”) through random selection and demographic stratification;
- deliberation, which entails listening carefully and actively; a mix of various formats that alternate between small group and plenary discussions, and skilled facilitation;
- informed discussion by providing participants with adequate time and resources to learn and weigh expertise and evidence from a wide range of experts and stakeholders;
- independence of the process at arm’s length from the commissioning public authority;
- transparency of all materials – including process design, agendas, briefing documents, submissions, audio and video recordings, the report, and methodology – that should be available to the public, and
- publicity of the recommendations, the final report (often written in the words of participants themselves), and the public authority’s response to the recommendations.



From:
**Innovative Citizen Participation and New
Democratic Institutions**
Catching the Deliberative Wave

Access the complete publication at:
<https://doi.org/10.1787/339306da-en>

Please cite this chapter as:

OECD (2020), "Overview of existing principles", in *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions: Catching the Deliberative Wave*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/460a0f8f-en>

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document, as well as any data and map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area. Extracts from publications may be subject to additional disclaimers, which are set out in the complete version of the publication, available at the link provided.

The use of this work, whether digital or print, is governed by the Terms and Conditions to be found at <http://www.oecd.org/termsandconditions>.