

Appendix one | Deliberative democracy topic sheet

During deliberation participants need to think about the positions they hold, give reasons for the decisions they reach and listen to others respectfully. Ideally people try to make their points in terms that other participants can accept – through reference, for example, to widely shared principles on human rights, social justice, economic wellbeing or national security.

Deliberative democracy tries to introduce more of this kind of communication into democratic decision-making. So we might seek better deliberation in parliaments, local councils, newspapers (opinion columns and letters), political commentary and discussion on radio and television, in internet forums, in public hearings and in political meetings. Obviously, communication in all these settings often falls far short of deliberative ideals – for example when politicians engage in personal attacks on each other or someone argues a point based on pure self-interest.

How can more effective deliberation be promoted? Some advocates of deliberative democracy are interested in reforming parliament – making discussion less adversarial and more constructive. Others want to reform the media – to make it more responsible, promoting higher quality consideration of issues.

Recently some deliberative democrats have turned to the design of new kinds of forums that would enable more effective deliberation. Some of these forums involve bringing together advocates of different sides of a landuse issue – such as environmentalists, developers and community activists – in a setting that takes them out of their usual adversarial, point-scoring interaction. Stakeholder dialogues, conflict resolution, mediation and consensus-building are important here.

Other sorts of designed forums involve selecting ordinary citizens more or less at random from the entire population. The Australian Citizens' Parliament is one such design. Others include deliberative opinion polls, consensus conferences (one was held in Canberra on genetically modified foods in 1999), citizens' assemblies, and citizens' juries.

Some of the most important and influential deliberative processes involving ordinary citizens have been held in Australia – for example the "Dialogue with the City" held in Perth in 2003, which strongly influenced the West Australian Government's policy on city planning. In all these designs it is ordinary citizens who do the deliberating and make recommendations – though they can hear presentations from experts and advocates on different sides of an issue.

Deliberative democracy topic sheet cont'd

For deliberative democrats, a decision is legitimate when people affected by, for example, a government planning decision, such as a wind farm, are given the right, capacity, and opportunity to deliberate about that decision.

In these deliberative circumstances reason-giving and reflection are central. Government ought to listen to and consider the advice of the community or citizens involved in the deliberative process and provide them with a response. The Government is also required to give the citizens details as to why their decision or recommendation is accepted, in full or in part; or rejected by the government.

Criticisms of deliberative democracy include its challenging adversarial party politics and majority rule; downplaying voting in favour of government by reasoned discussion, and failing to adequately address the unequal distribution of political power in society.

Overall, however, deliberative democracy generally aims to increase participation in the democratic process by ordinary citizens.

By John Dryzek and Carmel Anderson
Provided to participants in the 2009 Citizens' Parliament.

Appendix two | 2009 Citizens' Parliament goals

Why we are holding a citizens' parliament

1. To generate recommendations for reform of the Australian system of governance.
2. To provide a model and inspiration for deliberative civic engagement as a path toward better communities and governance.
3. To learn more about how citizens deliberate and the impacts of deliberation.

Goals of the 2009 Citizens' Parliament

1. To provide an opportunity for all involved to pioneer new ways of enhancing our democratic system of governance
2. To provide the space and tools to enable CP participants to jointly develop workable proposals for reform of the Australian system of governance.
3. To provide opportunities for the broader Australian community to have input to the proposals being developed by the CP, to help build support for the specific proposals recommended, and in so doing, potentially build support for deliberative civic engagement.
4. To encourage/engage the media to highlight stories of successful participation and of interesting proposals, encouraging their serious consideration by decision makers.
5. To provide the opportunity for participants to write a joint report of their recommendations, and assist in its dissemination to people of influence for their serious consideration
6. To provide a rich record of the citizens' interactions, proposals, attitudes, values, aspirations and preferences to research:
 - a. How deliberation changes preferences, values, judgments, and to what effect.
 - b. The capacity of citizens individually and collectively to cope with complex political issues.
 - c. The efficacy of this initiative as an exercise in deliberative democracy, including what it tells us about Australian democracy and reform possibilities.

Stage 1: Specific goals for regional meetings

1. To introduce participants to the Citizens' Parliament process, its purpose, their roles and the roles of others.
2. To understand participants' expectations and needs.
3. To assist participants to fill out initial surveys.
4. To create a sense of teamwork and find avenues for mutual help.
5. To enable participants to develop ideas for reform they would like to pursue online.
6. To assist participants to use the online format to develop their proposals, and to access information and assistance.

Stage 2: Specific goals for online deliberation

1. To provide exercises and support material to help participants learn and practise online dialogue and deliberation in particular and deliberation in general.
2. To help participants develop proposals to be debated at the CP.
3. To enable participants to post questions to experts.
4. To provide opportunities for networking and collaboration among the 150 Citizens' Parliament participants, for example, reviewing proposed ideas and creating new teams.
5. To provide a simplified public face for displaying proposals and eliciting public feedback and support.
6. To maintain a rich collection of data on participant interactions.

Stage 3: Specific goals for the 2009 Citizens' Parliament 'sitting' and follow-up

1. To provide the space and opportunity for dialogue and deliberation over 3 ½ days, using a variety of techniques.
2. Through these deliberative processes, to facilitate participant understanding of different viewpoints, identify criteria for evaluation and weighing of options, and develop recommendations.
3. To provide the opportunity for participants to write a final report of their findings.
4. To document interactions, attitudes, values, aspirations and preferences in order to research individual and group shifts in attitudes, values, aspirations and preferences as a result of deliberation, together with reasons for such shifts or lack thereof.
5. To research the efficacy of such deliberations in terms of participants' sense of ownership of outcomes, satisfaction with process, individual and group learning, and the potential for such processes to generate innovative ideas and result in increased political participation.
6. To find opportunities to ensure the findings of the Citizens' Parliament are heard, understood, and seriously considered by those in positions of influence.

Appendix three | Reference panel membership

The reference panel for the 2009 Citizens' Parliament was:

James Button: Journalist and author covering political and social issues; formerly with *The Age* (Melbourne). A Walkley Award recipient for feature writing. Recently joined the office of the Prime Minister as a speech writer.

Hon. Fred Chaney AO: Reference Panel Chair and Citizens' Parliament Co Chair.

Kath Fisher: Citizens' Parliament Facilitator Coordinator; Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, Graduate Research College, Southern Cross University.

Geoff Gallop: Professor and Director, Graduate School of Government, University of Sydney.

David Hamill: Former Queensland ALP politician (QLD Treasurer, Minister for Education, Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development). Currently a director of several corporations and NGOs and Chairman of the Australian Red Cross Blood Service.

Martin Krygier: Gordon Samuels Professor of Law and Social Theory; Co-Director, Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies of Law.

Alannah Mac Tiernan: An ALP member of the Western Australian Legislative Assembly, and Minister for Planning and Infrastructure in the West Australian government until 2008.

Campbell Newman: Lord Mayor of Brisbane, the largest local government area in Australia, elected in 2004 and re-elected in 2008.

Simon Sheikh: National Director of community advocacy group GetUp!, an independent, grass-roots community advocacy organisation giving everyday Australians opportunities to get involved in important issues.

David Yencken: Professor Emeritus at the University of Melbourne – Public Policy (Policy and Political Science: Policy and Administration).

APPENDIX FOUR | THE OMBUDSMAN OF THE CITIZENS' PARLIAMENT

A free, independent alternative dispute resolution system

Through mediation or negotiation we try to help people resolve issues when they believe that they have been treated unfairly by the Citizens' Parliament or its officers. This helps to safeguard the community in its dealings with the Citizens' Parliament, and ensure that its processes are fair and accountable.

Our aim is to resolve issues informally and quickly. We are neutral, impartial and confidential within the limits of the law. We will not give advice to either party, make decisions for a party, or impose a solution on the parties.

We are not an advocacy service, and we cannot override the decisions of the Citizens' Parliament, nor issue directives to its officers. To support an outcome, we may make formal recommendations to the relevant person or body. If it is not appropriate for us to deal with an issue, we will explain the reasons to the person raising the issue.

How the scheme works

People should first try to resolve their issue directly with the people most directly involved, before they contact the Ombudsman.

They can request mediation from the Ombudsman. They can contact us online, by email, phone, fax, or mail. We will acknowledge this contact promptly.

When contacted, we will describe the resolution process to the people involved, address any concerns that they have, and to confirm their willingness to participate in the process. We will then speak with the parties individually to gain an overview of the issues, and to help them prepare for their role in the resolution process.

During the resolution process itself, the focus will be on helping the parties to express and hear from each other the various perspectives and then to work together to craft some agreements for the future. These agreements may be recorded in part or in full.

People can take a complaint directly to an appropriate Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC). The Ombudsman can help identify which one they should approach. The Ombudsman may also suggest to participants that they take an issue to that HREC, for example if a mediation is unsuccessful. We will report to the Citizens' Parliament, as appropriate..

**To contact the Ombudsman,
phone 0407 044 020 or
email ombudsman@hollierhart.com.au**

Phillip Hart
phillip.hart@hollierhart.com.au

Fiona Hollier
fhollier@hollierhart.com.au

The Ombudsman service is provided by Hollier and Hart, a specialist consultancy focussing on helping people obtain constructive outcomes from difficult conversations.

The Principals are Fiona Hollier and Phillip Hart, both of whom are nationally accredited mediators, with many years significant experience in mediation and facilitation, skills development in a range of contexts in the private, public and non-government sectors. For more information, see www.hollierhart.com.au.

Appendix five | Support team roles

Thank you for nominating and providing your skills and expertise to support the Citizens' Parliament. There will be approximately 150 participants at this event

Lead facilitator role (1)

Overall task

- Lead the agenda throughout the proceedings
- Co-ordinate the proceedings
- Make changes to the agenda and timing to keep the day on track and on time

Table facilitator role (23)

Overall task

- Support the deliberation process at your table - the team, task and individual
- Be neutral – stay out of the content of the discussion
- Ensure everyone has the opportunity to express themselves and listen to others
- Provide leadership to the table/group – without taking control

Specific tasks

- Guide group discussion to keep it on track
- Ensure all group members are heard and all members listen
- Ask open questions that require reflection and consideration
- Invite different views, including objections to what is being said
- Help the group to seek common ground but do not force consensus
- Help the group come to their own decisions, taking into account all members' opinions
- Ensure the inputs of scribes (participants entering data), reflect the group views
- Stay friendly and calm, and create an atmosphere where participants enjoy the experience
- Seek the support of your designated Area Facilitator if you need assistance
- Listen carefully for any changes in the agenda from the Lead Facilitator.

Information and tips

- There will be approximately 23 tables, each with up to 8 participants at this event
- You have been allocated to a table which is in a cluster of tables
- An Area Facilitator will be overseeing the tables in your cluster and will come and sit/stand at your table periodically, to see how things are going
- Please welcome participants to your table and lead the group member introductions

- It is important that you role model the discussion ground rules, in particular showing respect for all participants
- You are the link between your table and the proceedings for the day
- Refer to the Forum Agenda regularly and keep the group focussed on their task within the allotted time
- Listen carefully for any changes to the agenda from the Lead Facilitator and if needed, provide further explanation to your team
- Ensure all participants have an opportunity to be heard and equalise participation where necessary
- A simple way to do this is to 'go round robin' – that is, begin at one part of the circle and move around so that everyone gets a go
- Do not take part in the discussion or provide your views. Your role is to balance the needs of the team, the task and the individuals at your table
- If silence occurs, re-state the group task and/or the question on the Agenda they are to respond to
- Open ended questions may also assist participants to tell their story
- When small group discussion time is up, it is important that you get your table to be quiet
- Listen to instructions from the Forum organisers and your Area Facilitator

Area Facilitator Role (2) and Coordinating Facilitator (1)

Overall task

- Co-ordinate, keep alert to the overall group dynamics of your designated tables, and if requested by facilitators or table teams in difficulty, problem solve for those tables
- Provide the link between your designated tables and the Co-ordinating Facilitator (and hence the Lead Facilitator)

Specific tasks

- Move around to designated tables to provide support, guidance and assistance to the Table Facilitators and also to teams if they have difficulty with a Table Facilitator
- Look out for and help your designated Table Facilitators deal with difficult team dynamics which block participation
- Seek support from the Coordinating Facilitator if you need assistance

Information, hints and tips

- There will be approx 23 tables, each with up to 8 participants at this event
- You have been allocated the role of overseeing a designated number of tables in a cluster and will need to sit/stand at each table periodically, to see how things are going
- At the preparatory session before the forum begins, ensure all tables have facilitators
- Assist in the table facilitator briefing prior to the forum

- It is important that you role model the discussion ground rules, in particular showing respect for all participants
- You are the link between your tables and the proceedings for the day
- Provide feedback to the Coordinating Facilitator, and when needed, to the Lead Facilitator on any timing or other issues that arise
- The Coordinating Facilitator can provide support for difficult problems that arise
- Respond promptly to any red or green cards raised at the tables, ensuring the table receives the computer or content support needed
- Refer to the Forum Agenda regularly and keep the table facilitators focussed on their task within the allotted times
- Check that all participants have an opportunity to be heard and assist in equalising participation where difficulties in group dynamics arise
- Do not take part in the discussion or provide your views
- Your role is to support facilitation
- You may need to take over facilitation eg. to allow a table facilitator to visit the rest room or have a break, if they have a difficult group
- Attend all feedback sessions during the day as shown on the Agenda
- You are an integral part of the debriefing session at the end of the day
- Any ideas you have about refining group facilitation processes for future Forums, are welcome

Scribe Role (23 - one participant volunteer from each table)

Overall task

- Input to the computer the table's individual, team and minority views. (Note, these are brief to minimise the amount of typing needed)
- For team views, check back with the facilitator to ensure what is submitted is an accurate reflection of team agreements

Specific tasks

- Input team ideas by typing the facilitator's summation of the team idea into the appropriate space on the computer screen
- If there is a strongly held minority idea, input it to the computer adding the words 'minority view' before the comment
- Input the individual polling results read out by the facilitator onto the appropriate place on the computer screen

Theme Team Role (6)

Overall task

- Together with a partner, analyse the table inputs of a designated number of tables to find common themes within a specified time frame
- Type themes in easy to understand English, where possible in participants' words
- Where you can find an 'ideal' quote representing that theme, include it after the theme, with the table number added at the end of the quote
- Submit the common themes and quotes to the theme team co-ordinator to summarise and prepare for participant viewing
- Stay calm under time pressures

Specific tasks

- Read through all the incoming table submissions
- Search for themes
- Create a set of themes using participant words where possible
- Where feasible, include specific quotes to illustrate the theme - including the table #
- If there are interesting or potentially useful minority views, add them with the table#, clearly designating that they are minority views
- Relay the themes to the Theme Team Coordinator within the time set
- Promptly relay on to the Theme Team Coordinator if there are any problems occurring with inputs from tables

Theme Team Coordinator (1) Role

Overall task

- Synthesise the themes created by the theme team pairs
- Find 'ideal' quotes to represent each theme, and add table number after the quote
- Create PowerPoint to display on large screens for the whole room

Specific tasks

- Read through the incoming theme team submissions
- Search for themes
- Create a set of themes representing the room's views using participant words where possible
- Support each theme with a specific quote from a table, adding the table number
- Where useful, add minority views including the table # to the end of the themed list, clearly indication that they are minority views
- Create PowerPoint presentations to display qualitative themes
- Broadcast the themes on the screens within set time frames

Discussion Ground Rules

These ground rules relate to all participants including the support team:

- Speak openly and honestly
- Listen carefully to what others have to say
- Treat everyone with respect
- Keep comments brief and to the point of the question/work sheet
- Stay on task
- If you need to take a break – do so

Appendix Six | Notes for facilitators

Notes for Table Facilitators | Day 1 Icebreaker

17	4.20pm (30 mins)	Dialogue Starter Max	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max Introductions – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small group introductions/dialogue - Each person is asked to find something on them, in their pockets or handbag that says something about them as a person, say who they are and briefly comment on the object • What we want to achieve together - Dialogue:- What would you like to be saying about the process at the conclusion of the CP? Success would mean....what? 	Powerpoint Quote for the Day (JHK? to provide) Briefing notes for Facilitators
----	---------------------	-------------------------	---	--

Notes for Day 1: 17:

Max Hardy will introduce this simple ice-breaker activity. It is very straightforward. The only challenge will be to make sure everyone gets the chance to introduce themselves in the time available.

Allow time for people to talk about their aspirations for the Citizens' Parliament. At the conclusion of the CP you may want to refer back to what people at your table shared at this early stage.

Day 1 – Deliberating on Deliberation

20	5.40pm (3 mins)	Small group Dialogue (Individual Reflection) Max	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How we want to deliberate together - how to make this time together more fruitful than our usual conversations, meetings or workshops • Asks CPs to look at info sheet - <i>Participatory Groups Versus Conventional Groups</i> Table Facilitators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitators hand out <i>Participatory Groups Versus Conventional Groups</i> and ask CPs to read • Remind CPs to write notes of their thoughts/reactions in Day 1 Worksheet 2 Individual Input <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each participant fills out their individual worksheet 	-Day 1 - Worksheet 2 -Info Sheet - <i>Participatory Groups Versus Conventional Groups</i> - Powerpoint slide of Info Sheet above (Max to provide)
21	5.43pm (17 mins)	Small group Dialogue (Group Discussion)	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max Team discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask people to share their views on how this deliberation could be different to usual conversations, meetings and workshops - eg productive, caring, reflective • Encourage the team to ask questions and make connections with what they and others said • Keep the focus on the positives, possibilities (rather than why it's not possible or can't work) 	-Day 1 - Worksheet 2
22	6.00pm (5 mins)	Plenary Feedback	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask 1-2 random CP groups for some brief highlights, eg selecting whoever has a birthday today / this week or geographical random selection. • Facilitators to report for group or to offer the microphone to one of the team - their discretion 	3 roving microphones

Notes for Day 1: 20, 21 and 22 | This short session will provides some time for participants at your table to write down their thoughts about how they want to work together, and then to share their thoughts with each other. Importantly it presents an opportunity for you as the Table Facilitator to define your role – as the person who will serve the group by assisting them to work together in the way that they would like to.

During the plenary session some table will be invited to share what has been agreed to at their tables – roving microphones may approach your table. You can either speak on behalf of your group, or invite one of the participants to do so. Use your judgment here. We are looking for a positive start.

Day 2 – World Café

8	8.40am (58 mins)	World Café Input Session (WC)	<p>Co-Lead Facilitator - Max Briefly explains the World Café, including the 3 questions to be explored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When our democracy is at its best, what is it that we appreciate? • How can our democracy be more like this more often? • What can be learnt from this? <p>Table Facilitator/Scribes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this instance, table facilitators take the role of 'host' and as such, scribe key points • At the end of each question session, the scribe submits to the computer the team's 3 - 4 key issues that arose during the discussion • Model good scribe behaviour of checking with the team before submitting an issue <p>Theme Team</p> <p>The theme team synthesises inputs, creating up to 10 dot points per Issue under the headings of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'What makes us Proud of our Democracy? • 'How our Democracy can be more like this more often? • 'What can be learnt from this' • (The Theme Team has 20 mins following this exercise to complete this) 	<p>3 Powerpoint slides 1 question on each - Butchers paper to cover each table as Café 'tablecloth'. - Coloured marker pens (6-8 per table) - At close of CP butchers' paper 'tablecloths' to be displayed on boards for all to see - Computer Screen headed Question (state) and Key Issues</p>
---	---------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--

Notes for Day 2: 8 | Most facilitators are familiar with this process. Max Hardy will explain to participants. As table facilitators you will serve as hosts for the process. Each round you will have different participants. We anticipate 3 -4 conversations for this world café so you will have 3-4 different groups.

Some hints are as follows:

- Avoid going over what has been discussed at your table in previous rounds. Instead invite your new participants to share what they have found interesting, challenging or even surprising at their previous tables. This creates more energy and interest.
- Try to allow all participants to contribute every round.
- Toward the end of the round see if you can come up with the key points that have emerged. Type in the key points into the PCs for the theme team to analyse.
- This is an 'appreciative' exercise – so even though participants will find it easier to nominate things they DON'T like, the aim here is to understand what people DO like.

Day 2 – 10 points 'Proud Democracy'

14	11.00am (3 mins)	Results (WC) <i>'What makes us Proud of our Democracy';</i> <i>'How it can be more like this more often';</i> <i>'What can be learnt from this'</i>	Co-Lead Facilitator Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approx 10 key points of the following 3 slides are projected into the room <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'What makes us Proud of our Democracy. 'How our Democracy can be more like this more often? 'What can be learnt from this' Administration (Table Facilitators) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If table feels strongly that an important issue was omitted, facilitator writes it onto empty Worksheet 1, and hands it to the table facilitator to give to the Area Coordinator 	Powerpoint -3 slides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>'What makes us Proud of our Democracy';</i> <i>How our Democracy can be more like this more often';</i> <i>'What can be learnt from this'</i>
----	---------------------	--	---	--

Notes: | Self explanatory.

Day 2 – Open Space Session

28	2.50pm (5 mins) (35 mins)	Open Space Market Place Team formation And discussion	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-lead facilitator briefly outlines the process and principles of Open Space Group Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals/issues of concern/interest you would like to follow-up/understand/discuss further The CP who nominates the idea announces it to the room (using microphone) and it is posted on wall together with name of nominator and the space where the group will meet Concurrent information discussion sessions are posted about specific issues (eg voting systems, deliberative democracy/empowering the people, State/Federal relations) Participants 'sign up' to a group/issue they are interested in pursuing Participants move to their team and commence discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Powerpoint of Open Space Principles Boards on which to post ideas, Bluetack or pins, Marker pens, A4 or larger sheets of paper for ideas
29	3.30pm (30 mins)	Afternoon Tea	<i>Note: Dining room will need to be vacated for private function on Sat evening</i> <i>Open Space Teams will meet outside or in other rooms in Old Parliament House</i>	Remove computers, etc from dining room

30	4.00pm (45 mins)	Open Space (Cont)	<p>Co-Lead Facilitator - Max</p> <p>Open Space Small Group Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each group continues to explore their issue • Participants can move between groups (bumble bee) or work in their own space (butterfly) • A Facilitator/Reporter with each team, writes up a short summary (on laptop), checking with team to ensure it correctly portrays their discussion and findings 	<p>Reporters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Type team notes - Summarise findings for Prelim Report - Add any new Proposals to List
----	---------------------	----------------------	---	---

Notes for Day 2: 28-30 | Participants will sign up to explore the issues and ideas of most interest to them. Your role here is simply to encourage people to go where there interest is. If they disperse of course they may have more to report to their group when they reassemble – but best that people go where they are interested. You may be able to help facilitate the open space sessions, help honour the principles of open space, and the 'law of two feet' (people are free to move between groups to follow their interest – if you not finding it interesting and you are not contributing then it's your responsibility to move somewhere else).

1. Whoever comes is the right people: this alerts the participants that attendees of a session class as "right" simply because they care to attend
2. Whatever happens is the only thing that could have: this tells the attendees to pay attention to events of the moment, instead of worrying about what else could possibly happen
3. Whenever it starts is the right time: clarifies the lack of any given schedule or structure and emphasises creativity and innovation
4. When it's over, it's over: encourages the participants not to waste time, but to move on to something else when the fruitful discussion ends

Anything that you can offer to help people enter the process will be appreciated.

Day 2 – Highlights and Learnings

33	4.55pm (30 mins)	Plenary Feedback	<p><i>In House of Representatives Chamber</i></p> <p>Co Lead Facilitator – Max</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups are asked to deliver highlights - something surprising/new they learnt together • Each of the team reports will be posted in full around the hallway/on boards for all to read 	<p>Blue tack and Boards Reporters/Admin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Combined List of Proposals' Pp Day 3
----	---------------------	---------------------	---	---

Notes for Day 2 – 33 | Again, should be quite straightforward, although it would be great to encourage quieter members of the group to share something if they were genuinely fascinated by something that has happened. The focus is on learning. Discoveries – not about providing a soapbox for the more assertive members to try to persuade all CPs into seeing the world they do. Ideally, it would be great for people to share something where they have learnt something of value, or about something which has contributed to them having a different perspective – or at least something that they now have an open mind about.

Day 3 - BFOs

7	8.40am (20 mins)	Discussion in 2s; Volunteer CP BFOs (Blinding Flashes of the Obvious)	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max Discussion in 2s and Plenary Session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Briefly explains BFOs (Blinding Flashes of the Obvious) In 2s, CPs are asked to share their insights and BFOs thus far - a) What's something exciting that you have learnt? b) What's surprised you? 3) What's possible? (2 mins each) 4-5 CPs are asked to share their thoughts with the whole group (2-3 minutes each) Brief discussion/round-up of ideas 	- 3 roving microphones - Powerpoint of BFO Questions - <i>Reporters take dot point notes of key points made</i>
---	---------------------	---	--	---

Notes for Day 3: 7 | This is simply about encouraging CPs to share their learnings and insights. We are wanting to foster a spirit of enquiry; of respectful curiosity. If something exciting or special is shared then give us a wave and we might get the microphone in your direction. It's a way of sharing the journey and building some momentum.

Day 3 - Fishbowl

28	12.09pm (4 mins)	Fishbowl Explanation; Introduces the Fishbowl Participants	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains the technique of a fishbowl Introduces the topic: Which proposals come to mind as best reflecting our #1 priority characteristic of a healthy political system'? Invites CPs to the stage (6-8 CPS who have been selected by CPs in a prior secret ballot - who they would like to hear deliberating on stage); as well as questioners (Carson, Kathy?) Gives those on stage a copy of the 'Prioritised List of all our Proposals to Strengthen our Political System' (with the Top 10 in bold) The 'Prioritised List of all our Proposals to Strengthen our Political System' is simultaneously disseminated to all CPs via Area Coordinators and Table Facilitators Start by getting joint understanding of #1 Priority Characteristic 	Chairs for 7 people in semi circle (5 CPs, Carson and Kathy) and microphones - Hard copy of 'Prioritised List of all our Proposals to Strengthen our Political System' 1 per CP
----	---------------------	--	--	---

29	12.13pm (3 mins)	Results 4 <i>a) Top 5 Characteristics.</i> <i>b) Priority Chart of Characteristics</i> <i>c) #1 Characteristic</i>	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reads the list of the top 5 characteristics of a healthy democratic political system • Explains that the Fishbowl is only dealing with the 1st priority characteristic • Reflects on the Top 10 list of Proposals, asking CPs to refer to their own copied Lists Les - Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare Day 4 Worksheet 5 • Photocopy, 1 per CP 	3 Powerpoint slides a) 'Top 5' b) 'Priority Chart' c) '#1 Priority'
30	12.16pm (18 mins)	Fishbowl Exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Then discuss a range of proposals that reflect that priority • Focus questions on inquiry and exploration rather than consolidation or consensus • Thanks participants and asks them to resume their seats 	Researchers - Take dot point notes of key points
31	12.34pm (2 mins)	Results 4 Cont. <i>-Top 5</i> <i>- '#2 Priority'</i>	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefly shows the slide of the 'Top 5 Characteristics • Shows the slide of #2 Priority 	2 Powerpoint Slides <i>- Top 5</i> <i>- #2 Priority</i>

Notes for Day 3 – 28-31 | Essentially the fishbowl is an observation exercise. It's an opportunity for CPs to take notes, reflect on the conversations, and to help them to prepare for delivering their input in the following session. Use the red card if you need assistance – perhaps to clarify anything that was mentioned. If time permits we may be able to field some questions from tables, or even invite a CP onto the stage to join the conversation – it all depends on how the dynamics are and how we are doing for time.

Day 3 – Small Group Dialogue

35	1.40pm (20 mins)	Small group Dialogue	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which proposals come to mind as best reflecting #2 Priority characteristic of a healthy democratic political system? • Start by getting joint understanding of #2 priority • Then discuss a range of proposals that reflect that priority, including why 	Day 3 Worksheet 6 Researchers - take dot point notes
----	---------------------	----------------------	--	---

38	2.12pm (20 mins)	Small group Dialogue	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief check - What would we need to look for in selecting the most innovative initiative? Which of the projects come to mind as the most innovative initiatives? Participants write their choices down as individuals and then report what they have written. This can be done on A5 sheets and grouped by table facilitators. 	Day 3 Worksheet 7 A 5 Sheets Reporters - take dot point notes
43	2.46pm (20 mins)	Small group Dialogue	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief check -What would we need to look for in selecting the easiest to implement initiative? Which of the projects come to mind as the most easy to implement initiatives? After writing down individually on worksheets, the talking stick is used to allow equal time for participants to explain their point of view. Can also use popcorn process – where stick is returned to the centre and participants choose when they want to speak. After talking stick exercise Table facilitators invite participants to report if any were persuaded by other contributions. 	Day 3 Worksheet 8 Talking stick – cardboard - from Cling Wrap rolls Researchers - take dot point notes
49	3.53pm (20 mins)	Small group Dialogue	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief check - What would we need to look for in selecting the most important proposal in the long term? Which of the projects come to mind as the most important to implement in the long term? 	Day 3 Worksheet 9 Researchers - take dot point notes

Notes for Day 3 – 35, 38, 43, 49 | These sessions are fairly straightforward. CPs will fill in worksheets and then have the opportunity to share their thoughts and explore ideas. There is no expectation of arriving at consensus or that this is about reaching agreement as to how they may record their preferences. Encourage exploration, reflection and the testing of assumptions. Use your facilitation skills to help the group to do their best thinking.

Day 3 – Free time!

52	4.26pm (20 mins)	Quiet reflection / time out	Co-Lead Facilitator - Max <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunity for people to go for a walk – to do some personal reflection, have a chat with anyone at all in the room, and then to return in 10 minutes. Share their best thought with the table upon their return. 	Reporters - Take dot point notes of Plenary
----	---------------------	--------------------------------	--	--

Notes for Day 3 – 52 | A bit of down time – a chance for CPs to do whatever they need to do to process information and take care of themselves.

Day 4 – Cardstorming exercise to reflect on the CP experience

9	8.55am (30 mins)	Small group Dialogue	<p>Co-Lead Facilitator - Max</p> <p>Small group Dialogue - Exercise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlights, lowlights, insights • Card storming at tables. Large sticky notes. Highlights, things that could have been better, insights. • Table facilitators theme with CPs: 2 'Highlights' per table to sticky wall; 2 'Lowlights' on other sticky wall; 1-2 Insights on another. • Themed on sticky walls by recorders or volunteer CPs during morning tea break 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Powerpoint Yes - Large sticky notes about half A5 size - Roving microphones on standby - Reporters make dot points of key points
10	9.25am (5 mins)	Plenary	<p>Co-Lead Facilitator - Max</p> <p>Plenary Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlights, Lowlights, Insights displayed on sticky wall. • CPs and facilitators comment on some of the key issues raised • Themed properly at morning tea by volunteer CPs and facilitators - for all to see. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reporters type up the themes completed during morning tea for Prelim Report

Notes for Day 4 – 9-10 | Instructions for this exercise will be available on slide. Your task is to help form the high points and low points into themes. These themes will be part of the feedback process. Themes should be written on pieces of A5 paper with a colourful border around them. Then the themes will be themed on the Sticky Walls that have been mounted on the panels. Again roving microphones will be used to capture some of the perspectives, insights. Again, encourage those who may be a little quieter to share with the whole CP. Perhaps you can stand with such people, or even, with their agreement, speak on their behalf (but only for those who are very shy).

Day 4 - Debrief

21	12.10pm (20 mins)	Debrief	<p>Co-Lead Facilitator – Max</p> <p>Personal Reflections – writing on flip chart paper at the table</p> <p>Final Small Group Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did I expect to happen at the CP? • What did happen? • How did it affect me? • What did I learn about - Myself? Others? Our political system? 	<p>Flip chart</p> <p>3 roving microphones to allow reflections to be shared.</p> <p>Reporters make dot points of key themes</p>
22	12.30 (10 mins)	Plenary	<p>Co-Lead Facilitator – Max</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitators and CPs volunteer highlights from their conversations 	

Day 4 – Thanks!

28	2.30pm (5 mins)	Thank you	<p>Co-Lead Facilitator - Janette and Max</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asks Support Team to stand • Thanks the various event support groups (facilitators, theme team, researchers, IT, event management/support) 	
----	--------------------	-----------	--	--

Notes: | Help your group celebrates their achievements, their learnings and their contributions!

Appendix seven: How citizens were randomly selected

By Ron Lubensky

9653 citizens were randomly drawn from the roll of every federal electorate and posted invitations to participate. From these, we were overwhelmed with 2762 online and telephone registrations, an astounding 28.6% response rate. This ranks amongst the best returns for any large-scale deliberative event held worldwide to date! It may have been even better had not several hundred invitations been returned due to obsolete addressing.

This article describes the procedure used to randomly select the 150 Citizens' Parliament participants from the registrations.

Ideally, the Citizens' Parliament of 150 participants should be a microcosm of the Australian population. A commitment was made to include one participant from each of the 150 federal electorates. The distribution of gender, age (18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65+) and education (year 11 or below, form 6/year 12, TAFE qualification, bachelors degree, postgraduate degree) categories should match as close as possible to that of the entire adult population, with quotas derived from census and other data available at the Australian Bureau of Statistics website. For gender, we aim for an ideal 50-50 split. We also require Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander representation (ideally three participants, corresponding to 1.9% of the adult population).

If we just randomly select from the entire pool of registrations, the statistical probability of matching the quotas would be small. Moreover, the demographic distribution of those who registered may not match that of the larger population. As is typical of public engagement endeavours, we received an oversupply of registrations from middle-aged citizens.

We set an arbitrary tolerance (ie. range above and below the quota, as a percentage of the quota) on each category group. We were keen to gain a very precise gender balance ($\pm 5\%$), but we demanded less precision of age ($\pm 10\%$) and education ($\pm 25\%$) which have multiple categories.

So how do we balance the apparently contradictory mission of randomness and demographic matching? The solution is to apply a variant of a technique called stratified random sampling.

We began by randomly selecting from registrations that identified as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. We then divided the others by remaining electorate and drew randomly from each in turn. As the random selection procedure proceeds, each category fills up. When a category reaches the top of its tolerated quota, we discard all remaining registrations from all electorates who are in the same category. The procedure may run out of candidates before participants are drawn from all the electorates. To mitigate this problem, the electorate with the leanest count is always drawn next.

The random selection for the Citizens' Parliament is completed using a computer program. Each run produces a different result due to randomisation. Starting at a tight set of category tolerances, we ran the program up to several hundred times until a result was generated. If not, we'd loosen a tolerance based on reports and repeat. We then conducted the official runs to find the final selection. We stopped at the very first successful run. At no time was the registration file altered or a selection file reviewed in the lead-up to the final run.

The procedure that a computer performs to do something complex is called an algorithm. Although expressed in English, it is technical in nature, using terms that have specific meaning to technologists. If you require clarification about this algorithm, or you wish to examine its implementation in the computing language JavaScript, please contact the Research Team.

1. Zero counters for all demographic categories (gender[2], age[6], education[5], aboriginality[1]).

2. Set quotas and tolerances for each category based on census data.
3. Divide all registrants into their 150 electorate sets, plus an Aboriginal set.
4. Repeat until the quota number of Aboriginal participants is found or no more left to select.
 - a. Randomly select an Aboriginal participant from the Aboriginal set.
 - b. Increment counters for all categories to which the participant belongs.
 - c. Discard other Aboriginal registrants in the same electorate.
 - d. Discard the corresponding electorate set.
5. Sort the electoral sets by increasing number of registrants.
6. Repeat until no more electorate sets.
 - a. If the first electorate set is empty, abort "electorate depleted".
 - b. Randomly select a participant from the first electorate set.
 - c. Increment counters for all categories to which the participant belongs.
 - d. Discard the first electorate set.
 - e. If any category counters are at maximum then:
 - i. Discard all registrants left in electorate sets that belong to the maxed-out categories.
 - ii. Re-sort the electorate sets by increasing number of registrants.
7. If any category counters have less than the minimum acceptable count, abort "insufficient in category".
8. Finish "success".

Supplementary Random Selection

Twenty-five of the 150 people who registered and then were randomly selected to participate in the Citizens' Parliament either declined or did not confirm the offer. This meant that we had to mount a supplementary round to randomly select the participants. In the interest of transparency, this article describes how this was carried out on 15 September, 2008.

Recall that our objective was to randomly select, from the registration pool of over 2700 citizens, one participant from each of the 150 federal electorates such that certain demographic categories were distributed like the general population.

The supplementary draw is designed to match the demographic distribution of the people who did not accept places in the first round, and just for those electorates that remain unfilled. Thus the overall distribution is maintained.

After the first round, one registered citizen who declared as indigenous did not confirm. With only a dozen indigenous registrations altogether to choose from, we looked at the roster and found one other person in the same electorate as the original declared as indigenous, who also happened to be male and of about the same age. We selected him arbitrarily and confirmed his attendance.

We then reconfigured the same program used in the initial random selection, but this time to only choose from a registration pool of 25 electorates, and with demographic quotas set to match the

distribution of those who didn't accept. Only the one selected indigenous person was included in the pool, to include all his demographic dimensions in the distribution.

Initial runs on the same tolerances did not achieve a result. The difficulty was that 44% (ie. 11) of the 25 non-acceptances declared an educational level of Year 11 or below, which was much higher than the norm. Counter-intuitively, the tolerance on education was tightened, which more severely capped the levels of other educational categories. The first successful run was realised shortly thereafter, the results of which are shown below.

Henceforth, a different process will be applied if participants are unable to fulfil their commitment to attend the final sitting of the Citizens' Parliament in Canberra. A replacement will be arbitrarily chosen from the same electorate as the withdrawn participant, with the closest demographic match to the withdrawn participant in priority order of aboriginality, gender, age and education. The rationale is that randomness not only applied to the selection of the original person, but to his or her demographic categorisation, which we formulaically re-apply to a different candidate in the electorate. If there are multiple candidates, we choose the citizen who has made more posts to the Online Deliberation as part of the Online Parliament. If this is not demonstrable, then we will roll a dice.

Addendum 10 Dec 2008

The random selection of last minute replacements will change. The Citizens Parliament Regional Meetings have been a vital way to introduce Citizen Parliamentarians to the topic of 'strengthening our political system' and to the deliberative process of the planned Citizens' Parliament. However, since there will be no more Regional Meetings after 14 Dec, any additional replacements required after this date will be randomly selected from the Online Parliament, aiming for someone from each electorate. This will ensure all participants in the Citizens Parliament have had an introduction to the topic and the process of the Citizens Parliament before joining the deliberations on 6th February 09.



It is our privilege to advise that

First / Last Name

*has been randomly selected
from the electoral rolls to register for*

Australia's first Citizens' Parliament

*6 – 9 February 2009,
Old Parliament House, Canberra*

RSVP: see over

Fred Chaney AO

Lowitja O'Donoghue AC CBE DSG

This invitation to register has been sent to less than 0.05 per cent of Australians, from the electoral rolls.

One registered citizen will be further randomly selected, from each of the 150 Federal electorates, to come to Canberra next February to join the first Citizens' Parliament.

This is a unique opportunity for everyday Australians to discuss ways to improve our political system, and make recommendations to Government.

Travel, meals and accommodation will be provided.

RSVP: Please register by 22 August 2008 at www.citizensparliament.org.au or call 1800 015 600.

The Citizens' Parliament is independent of any political donations or funding.

Appendix nine | Letter to randomly selected participants

Participant's name
And address

Citizens' Parliament-Old Parliament House 6-9 February 2009

Dear xxxxxxxx

Congratulations! We are pleased to advise that you have been randomly selected to participate in the first Australian Citizens' Parliament, culminating in your attendance at Old Parliament House on 6-9 February 2008. You will be joining the 150 randomly selected Citizens' Parliament members who will be working together to create recommendations about how we might strengthen Australia's political system to serve us better. We have enclosed a document answering some frequently asked questions to give you further information about the Citizens' Parliament.

If you can obtain access to the Internet, for example, through family or friends or at your local public library, we invite you to look closely at the Citizens' Parliament website at www.citizensparliament.org.au for further information relating to the event. Strengthening our democracy is the topic for the Citizens' Parliament. Unfortunately you won't be addressing other issues people may be interested in, such as the environment, health, education or taxation. A brief excerpt from the booklet 'Democracy Under Siege' is enclosed that will give you an idea of the topics relating to the political system which could be discussed at the Citizens' Parliament. But within the topic of strengthening our political system, the ideas to be discussed will come from you.

In the first stage of the Citizens' Parliament process you should attend a regional meeting. There you will meet other participants from the region, get to know more about the Citizens' Parliament, and identify issues of importance to you to start discussing on-line or later at the Citizens' Parliament. We will ask you to do an opinion charting survey, as well as to sign a consent form which is required by the Ethics Committees of the associated universities.

Please look at the enclosed schedule and note that your federal electorate is listed against a date for your regional meeting. Your electorate is... .. The meetings run from 9:45 am to 4:00 pm. Details of the venue and arrangements will be communicated to you and will also be posted on the website well before the meeting date.

Citizens' Parliament – *Putting people into politics*

P.O. Box R418, Royal Exchange NSW 1225 admin@citizensparliament.org.au www.citizensparliament.org.au



You may like to start reading some of the articles on the web site, or talk with friends and family about the sort of democratic system they would like, or read relevant articles from the newspapers, and possibly jot down issues that you would like to discuss at your regional meeting or the Citizens' Parliament.

While your costs of long distance travel and accommodation for the final Citizens' Parliament assembly in Canberra will be covered by the Citizens' Parliament project, we are trying to minimise the costs of the regional meetings. If you require air travel to get to your regional meeting, the cost and arrangements will be covered by the Citizens' Parliament project. Some support can be given if needed for other long distance travel costs, such as required overnight accommodation in the regional centre. As far as possible, please organise yourself to stay with friends or family.

If you accept this invitation to be the selected citizen from your electorate the following commitments are essential:

Stage 1: to attend your regional meeting;

Stage 2: to give some time (if possible) to the on-line discussions;

Stage 3: to attend the Citizens' Parliament in Canberra from 6-9th February 2009.

If you are not able to attend the regional meeting or attend the Citizens' Parliament in Canberra next February, you will still have an opportunity to contribute to the discussions on-line if you can access the Internet.

We will phone you during the coming week to ask whether you are able to participate as requested in this exciting event, the first Australian Citizens' Parliament. At that time, we can also discuss the costs and arrangements you require to get to the meetings.

If you have any questions regarding any aspect of the Citizens' Parliament, please call Joan on 1800 015 600 or Vickianne on 0419 460 592.

Yours sincerely

Fred Chaney AO

Lowitja O'Donoghue AC CBE DSG

Appendix ten | NSW-ACT citizens prepare for Australia's first citizens' parliament

Media Release | NSW-ACT citizens prepare for Australia's first Citizens' Parliament

Friday, 10 October 2008 09:00

NSW and ACT citizens take part tomorrow in an historic event by becoming among the country's first participants in a series of regional meetings that will lead up to Australia's first Citizens' Parliament at Old Parliament House from February 6 to 9 next year.

The regional meetings, online meetings scheduled to begin soon and the February Citizens' Parliament event are aimed at making democracy more accessible to Australians beyond the election cycle.

Representing eight federal electorates (Canberra, Cunningham, Eden-Monaro, Fraser, Hume, Macarthur, Riverina, Throsby) NSW and ACT citizens will attend a one-day meeting at the Australian National University in Canberra where they will think about the positions they hold in respect to the question: How can Australia's political system be strengthened to serve us better?

At tomorrow's meeting, the first of a series of activities in the lead-up to the Citizens' Parliament, people will be able consider the strengths of our governing institutions, respond to issues such as the limitations imposed by the election cycle and the influence of special interest groups.

According to a member of the organising committee, Kathryn Kelly from the ANU, the NSW-Canberra participants join 142 other citizens from around Australia who are also attending regional meetings throughout October and November to consider the deliberation question.

"Overall, more than 2500 people have registered as prospective participants in the Citizens' Parliament and associated activities," Ms Kelly said.

"Following the regional meetings, up to 2000 people will also deliberate online about the question in the lead-up to the February event.

"Their recommendations will be presented to the Prime Minister and all Members of Parliament."

The Citizens' Parliament is funded by an Australian Research Council Linkage Grant in conjunction with the newDemocracy Foundation.

For more information, please go to: www.citizensparliament.org.au

Media contact: Vickianne Lane, newDemocracy Foundation, on 0419 460 592

Appendix Eleven | Citizens' Parliament Regional Meetings Agenda

Location	PERTH (FREMANTLE)	Time	9.45-4.15	Date	12 October 2008
Facilitator					
Objective	To meet other participants, to share knowledge, to establish working relationships, to build deliberative confidence				
Program					
45 mins	Introductions Speed intros (LC to prepare) Socioline 3/2/1 activity				
60 mins	Opinion Charting (Q sort)				
15 mins	-BREAK-				
40 mins	Background What is a CP? [BC's CA Film + explanation of difference b/w CA & CP] Details of CP—Q&A				
30-45 mins (depends on size)	World Café What are the problems? What are your concerns? (one round) What actually needs to change? (two round + third round)(need large post-its)				
45 mins	-LUNCH-				
25 mins	Brainstorm Paperclip exercise—individual + whole group [to demonstrate collective wisdom] What ideas do you have to achieve change? [individual, then group using nominal group technique or dotmocracy]				
15 mins	Report What do other Australians think? Report back from other w/cafes & summit/s]				
70 mins	Simulation How to convert ideas to proposals—plenary [agree on idea, 10 mins; discuss, coalesce 40 mins] Show how it could be done via Civic Evolution				
20 mins	Sharing Resources & Future Research/Learning How will you work together online? 1 st steps for online learning & exchanges What happens when conflicting values arise? [No need to change—power of diversity and independent thought—get onto teams that agree with you or don't] Sharing resources ; some to take away [Discovering Democracy, Democratic Audit etc.]				
10 mins	Conclude What will happen next?				
Close: Total time = 6.5 hours					

Maximise opportunities for considering ideas and voting on them—as a way to create boundaries around the charge
 Maybe four categories: 1. I can accept this idea and move on; 2. This idea interests me—I want to know more; 3. I'm not rejecting this idea but I'm wary; and 4. I reject this idea.

Appendix twelve page 1



Citizens' Parliament

Brought to you in partnership with CivicEvolution

"How can Australia's political system be strengthened to serve us better?"



Online Parliament home page for Ian Marsh [Sign out](#)

[Help](#)
[Contact us](#)
[More actions...](#)



Get started: Join a proposal team now!

- Teams will develop proposals to strengthen Australia's political system so it can serve us better.
- Proposals should be focused on our system of government and not on the services provided by the government.
- Your proposals will directly influence the Citizens' Parliament in February, 2009.
- Join a team that interests you or start a new one. [Learn more](#) or [See how a team works](#)

[Click a proposal title to learn more and sign up.](#)

Improve the Governance and Accountability of Government with Finance.

A fairer and more efficient Government that is fully accountable for its action.

Sign up: This proposal team needs 3 more members to get started

The importance of civics in the high school curriculum

Encouraging the development of a civics unit that can be taught at high school covering these, and other, themes.

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Who's running the country, government or the media?

Politicians will have more time to spend doing what they were elected to do, and less time fulfilling the relentless demands of the media in all its forms

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Restriction of choice with two party system

Explore a system whereby we can vote with greater flexibility and choice.

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Extend government term to 5 years to have the ability for long term planning

To give the political system, the government and the opposition the ability to provide long term plans/solutions for the country in areas such as medical, ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Politics isn't appealing enough for the younger generation - we want young people to enrol to vote.

Starting at a grassroots level educate our Australian children about government, make it appealing and encourage the younger generation to ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

The ability to vote directly on legislation proposed by citizen initiative

Sometimes elected politicians aren't willing to sponsor vital legislation, this is a solution. For example, South Australians might then be able to vote ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Real Democracy; members of parliament chosen by lot (conditions apply)

The self interest factor that ruins most parliamentarians would be removed. The self perpetuating interest groups that now dominate, would be ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 2 more members to get started

Presidential style of government

The heads of each portfolio should be experts within the field if not, have a positive proven record with a minimum of practical experience.

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Gaining transparency on who makes the decisions rather than just the processes

Ultimately the voting public should be major players in the decision-making process for the benefit of all. Thereby ensuring that the political system ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

How to empower citizens for political participation

More Australian citizens will feel empowered to participate in politics.

This proposal team is full. Select another proposal or start a new one.

Party Politics - True Democracy or free for all slanging match?

A political system whereby the needs of Australia are paramount and party politics becomes far less binding on individual elected members. Allow more ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

More open scrutiny of the decisions of Government

Governments' decisions on expenditure are looked at and reported on more closely. Auditor General powers are extended to conduct 'policy ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 3 more members to get started

Compulsory voting promotes less informed choices

Review the compulsory voting legislation to allow a better reflection of the informed choices of those members of the Australian public who are willing ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 3 more members to get started

[Join a proposal team](#)

[Browse these proposals](#)



[Help](#)

We are over governed .

Less government departments . Unity in all states.Well appointed local area representation. Nola Flinders.

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

I propose a bill of rights-- Responsibility, Respect, Rights

I believe that an undetermined portion of the inhabitants of Australia have over the years thrown in the towel. For too many years they, we, have ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Accountability - Politicians not delivering on electoral promises

Politicians should be more accountable.

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Two Levels of Governments instead of three. Removal of State/Territory Governments

Removal of State and Territory Governments and the possibly reduce the number of Local Governments and giving them some extra responsibility. A ...

This proposal team is full. Select another proposal or start a new one.

One man one vote

Politicians should be the candidate who wins the most individual votes. This will result in the community electing the best person in their minds, for the ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Giving citizens access to unbiased information about the parliamentary proceedings

Want to know what my representative is doing and the work of the parliament. Hopefully to achieve the representatives being more ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Party Politics-Nuevo Nerds has destroyed Australia. We the people, deserve better representation

Much better representation for Australia, we have of late been, led up the garden path. Australia's outcome could be better much better, Medical ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 3 more members to get started

Political fear mongering dosen't improve democracy, it polarizes issues leaving a frustrated public

Remove the onslaught to cap the amount of days a particular detail of any issue maybe deliberated. Where school-yard behaviour is accountable the ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 2 more members to get started

Being the PM is the biggest job going. Let's pay that role accordingly to attract better people.

Attract smart, successful people into politics. Pay them for the job they do. Link pay to performance.

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Allow children to take part in democracy

A lower minimum voting age (e.g. optional voting for teenagers) and the establishment of formal consultation systems with children to ensure their ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 1 more member to get started

Politicians' superannuation and other excessive benefits!

Superannuation and other benefits should not be so out of kilter to the rest of the workforce. No excessive privileges or benefits for serving the ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Members communication with the public.

I hope through this the members will have more idea of what the electors need and be willing to take good ideas further.

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

At Question Time the Parliament throw insults at each other

Stay focussed on the real problems and improve confidence in Parliament.

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Penalise Politicians who resign in the first two years of their being elected to Office

Encourage quality candidates to stand for election. Reduce the cost of bye elections for the community

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Electronic Voting System, Using ID Card (Medicare Card)

Use the TAB computer for example. Swipe your Medicare card and then touch screen your vote. Counting is automatic. Results are available at ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

To unify the country's state laws so that moving from state to state will appear seamless

A unified system of administration (possibly centralised) which sees the areas of 1) education working under one syllabus for the whole of Australia with ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Coordination of the health care system's governing bodies

It is hoped that an effective health care system is achieved by the the coordination of Australia's health care providers, each knowing thier ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Unification of environmental data collection under one Federal body.

If the Bureau of Meteorology is now going to be the repository for all data collected surely it makes sense to collect it under the one set of rules and ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 1 more member to get started

Now it's time to become an Independent nation, not a nation of Dependents. Return our common sense

Responsibility should start at home.Parents teach kids to work and become independent. As is done in many countries in Europe, once you have ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 2 more members to get started

Quality education and quality teachers - the key to quality government and Australia's future.

Acknowledgement of the significance and importance of the role of teachers as a positive force for social, political and environmental change in ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Education- same accross all states

Just to make it easier for kids to transfer from school to school

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Expansionism, the wrong way to go economically , enviromentaly and politically

together we need to limit the overbearing drain and strain on the planets resources. Breeding needs to be discouraged to a manageable level, maybe ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 3 more members to get started

Government-Private Partnerships, A dead loss, an added burden to most Australians

I believe we could build a better Australia if we, governmental y ran the infrastructure of Australia ourselves and put the profits into the country's ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Make and Produce everthing Locally in Australia

Through government policy and initiatives, protect, develop and nuture our own industries, so that at the very least we become net exporters across ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

To eliminate multi-trade holding licenses to untrained contractors and toughen EPA laws they effect

Protection for both the consumer and the adequately qualified personel for below average workmanship from shoddy contractors who take advantage ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 2 more members to get started

All Australian Children, a guarantee to a standard of education for productive life

I hope legislation to protect learning for junior school children would be taught and enshrined in their self good. It would help take away the mess ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Sex offenders Who are we really protecting?

With the Proposal I hope to achieve some justice for the victims. Also All Sex offenders should have their names on the board. We as a society should ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 3 more members to get started

Australain's Gambling Situation

A solution here really needs to come from the banks but the government needs to step in to enforce this. **Credit Cards**

Sign up: This proposal team needs 3 more members to get started

Opening up more doors for adoption in Australia

Ultimatley I would like to see children who have been in a foster care system for a period of time, with no effort from there parents to be allowed to be ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Australian Road Legislation ""What a Joke""

Compulsory Defensive driving courses for our youth (implemented in education system) compulsory eye tests and resit of driving tests for our ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

There should be more services for children who have the diagnosis of Autism.

An awareness that Autism is a brain development disorder that is characterized by impaired social interaction and communication, and ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Equal and affordable access to mental heath services for all Australians

Accountability for the well-being of the nation; no more blame shifting between the states and nation. Funding to be better spent to reach the ...

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Road Laws and licence age should be uniform for all states

save lives

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members

Time Zones and Dear Old Daylight Savings, a body clock schock.

the achievement for Australia could be an emotional and physical lifting of the political induced fog upon the land . A present there is an unwarranted ...

Sign up: This proposal team needs 3 more members to get started

Encourage families to stay together.

Encourage families to stay together.

Sign up: This proposal team is accepting new members



Suggest a new proposal

If you don't see a proposal that interests you or addresses your concerns you can suggest a new proposal.

[Click to suggest a new proposal](#)



I don't see anything that interests me yet!



Email me when new teams are added

How can you explain this problem in 1-2 sentences?

Help me, what should I do here? Add a comment Suggest an answer

3 Suggested answers

The current preferential voting system ensures the dominance of the two major political parties. A "first past the post" system gives more accuracy to a voter's say.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree
votes 0 0 0 1 10 11 votes

Some of what you say may be true but the only way to correct this problem is with fines proportionate to their remuneration, if found guilty, this makes people think twice about coercive activity.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree
votes 1 0 1 1 3 6 votes

Politicians gaining a seat who may not necessarily be the people's most popular vote. Preferential voting is unfair and does not reflect the voters desired candidate.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree
votes 0 0 1 0 4 5 votes

Are you ready to move on?

Yes, I'm satisfied with this work

View new comments: 0 of 0 since Jul 7 09

Message	Author	Date	Stars
The current preferential voting system ensures the dominance of the two major political parties. A "first past the post" system gives more accuracy to a voter's say.	Paula (Bruce electorate)	Mon Dec 29 @ 20:37	11
I do not agree with preferential voting as it does encourage adonkey vote from electors who do not realise their vote can go to someone they do not wish to put into parliament	James (Casey electorate)	Thu Oct 30 @ 23:15	4
Hi all I met JH on the steps at Epping rail station 1973 To be outed by the Labour party,with help, and to me the best PM we have had, pref votes from a bunch of donkies ,, is not fair	Ronald (Bennelong electorate)	Wed Nov 05 @ 01:45	
i couldnt agree more, JH did such a wonderful job for this country. i cant help but think that no matter how we come up with ideas the parties will still do some dealings behind the scene to ...	Matthew (Mallee electorate)	Wed Nov 05 @ 13:08	2
Sorry to say Matthew. I do not agree with your JH suggestion but that is another point. My point here is while Big Business and those with an oportunity to benefit can donate to Major ...	David K. (Leichhardt electorate)	Thu Nov 06 @ 17:01	
political differences are great and one of the good things bout living here is that we can openly debate things openly. i dont agree with scraping the parties and just voting for	Matthew (Mallee)	Thu Nov 06 @ 17:14	

From: Paula (Bruce electorate)
Date: Mon Dec 29 @ 20:37
Version: 2 [Show history](#)
Rating: 10 team members agree with this answer

The current preferential voting system ensures the dominance of the two major political parties. A "first past the post" system gives more accuracy to a voter's say.

Please rate this answer:

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree
votes 0 0 0 1 10 11 votes

Reply with a comment Reply with an answer Edit Report

Appendix fourteen | Summary of online proposals

1. Proposal: Accountability regarding political promises

Politicians should be made to deliver on their promises. An independent auditor could report on progress of implementing promised programs or policies. At the end of the term, the political party could report on implementation of promises and why promises which weren't kept were not implemented.

2. Proposal: Bill of Rights and Responsibilities

A Bill of Rights entrenches in law basic rights that citizens have in the society. It could include freedom of speech and assembly, separation of judiciary, religious institutions and government, presumption of innocence, freedom from unwarranted search, seizure and arrest. Some suggested rights may be contentious, eg, right to life and freedom from unjust taxation, depending on interpretations.

Proposed responsibilities include to avoid force or fraud in relations with others, take responsibility for one's own behaviour, raise children in a safe, happy, healthy home and care for the environment.

3. Proposal: Citizen Initiated Referendum

A Citizen Initiated Referendum is a legislated provision to enable citizens to request a referendum (eg as in Switzerland which has regular CIRs and some States in the USA). To be put before the people, the proposal requires the signatures of a certain number of petitioners (eg 50,000 in Switzerland where if the vote achieves over 50% it is successful).

4. Proposal: Empowering citizens to participate in politics

This proposes making it easier for people to participate in politics, by providing more innovative and earlier education, such as using websites and public television and by providing forums, such as the Citizens' Parliament, to enable this participation to happen.

5. Proposal: Extend and fix the term of government

This proposes having a fixed term of government so the government is required to go to an election at regular intervals at a certain date. It also proposes longer terms of government to allow for long term planning, with elections being held every five years, with associated senate terms of ten years.

6. Proposal: Change the electoral system - First Past the Post

The proposal suggests removing preferential voting which is seen as unfair. (Preferential voting is where a person lists their preferences in votes for the election. Those with the least number of votes are eliminated and the votes they had are distributed according to their second preferences. This continues until a clear winner arises) Instead, a system of

'First past the post' is proposed where the person with the largest number of votes wins the election. In this system a person with less than 50% of the votes may win the election.

7. Proposal: Change the electoral system - Proportional Representation

This is a system where people are elected according to the percentage of the vote they receive. This makes it more likely independents and smaller parties may be elected.

8. Proposal: Change the electoral system - Introduce a Quota system

A quota system refers to a system where certain seats are allocated to particular groups, for example, in New Zealand there are specified seats for Maori and in the Labor Party, a certain number (quota) of seats must be contested by female candidates.

9. Proposal: Reduce duplication between levels of government - Remove State Level of Government

The proposal is to have only federal and regional governments, with local government to be replaced with larger regional councils. Major laws and policies would be decided at the federal level. A full senate election would be held at each general election.

10. Proposal: Reduce duplication between levels of government - Unify laws across state boundaries

Many laws which differ in the different states should be made consistent to avoid duplication or differing requirements. A task force could examine possibilities for unification of legislation across the states and territories. Suggested solutions also include rationalising local councils, federal control of issues and a legislated Bill of Rights.

11. Proposal: Youth engagement in politics

A specific education program to encourage and engage youth, including:

- A grassroots education program beginning early and appealing to younger generations;
- Education regarding listening to others' views, how to make your own decisions and learning to go with decisions arrived at through voting;
- Education focussing on all aspects of government, the setup, the history, the good and the bad; and
- Leadership programs which align with the electoral process and electing school leaders, with involvement of political leaders.

Appendix fifteen | One full proposal from the online parliament

Proposal: Extend and fix the term of government

Problem:

At present, after 2 years of a government being elected, speculation begins into the timing of the next election. The government is spending one third of its mandate in election mode. Any government can call an election at any time within its 3-year term. The nation suffers due to the inability of our political system to deal with situations/problems that require a long term solution. 3-year terms don't allow enough time to plan, develop and implement solutions, therefore no continuity between governments, only quick fixes due to media pressures.

A cynic could argue that short terms between elections barely allow time for policy/activity to advance a country sandwiched between campaigning and other activity of self-preservation of a government or an opposition. Fiscally, resources used for purely political campaigning could be channelled more usefully into the country.

Citizens should care because each election causes significant disruption to the country. The huge cost to taxpayers to run elections often reducing the term of office to help ensure re-election. This when polls indicate the public are beginning to question the validity of a government who are then able to call early elections to better suit their opportunity of being re-elected and by doing so divert attention from the issues that will be the cause of an election loss if the government were forced to complete a compulsory term in office.

Recommendation:

- 5-year terms for House of Reps, 10 years for Senate (half elected each cycle).
- Fixed term with no triggers for early elections except by death of parliament leader or Senate block of supply.

Justification:

- The proposal provides for stable government. Gives governments more opportunity to implement better long term policy. It removes party politics from election timing. Election costs will be reduced.

- A longer term in office might enable a government to pursue policy without the distractions of simply maintaining office and remaining in power. Thus more complex or time consuming plans and actions could be presented to constituents pre-election and a duly elected government have the opportunity to carry these out without the distractions of self-preservation coming around so frequently.
- If it was 5 years the Government has more chance of doing 'good policy' even if the policy is unpopular. The country has time to absorb the merit (even if unpopular) of the policy after the media/opposition hype has died down.
- They cannot call an election on a whim or while they are riding a high. This way they are held more accountable for the good and bad policies they create.
- A half Senate election would ensure this house relevance. If the government of the day always had the numbers in the Senate, it would no longer be a house of review and all legislation would be rubber stamped.
- A Full Senate election means that 12 Senators would be elected every 5 years from each State and 2 in each of the Territories. This could open the door for many independents and single issue parties. The Government of the day may never have a majority to pass its legislation, having to deal with numerous factions, all with their own self interest. Lawmaking could become a nightmare. Or Governments elected in a landslide may have a large majority in each house making both houses irrelevant.
- Fixed terms with a specific election date would eliminate constant destabilising media speculation of election timing. Everyone could get on with their business, knowing when elections would be held years in advance.
- If all elections are held at a specific time of the year (e.g. Feb/March) or better still a fixed date. States also moved to fixed terms. The Australian Electoral Commission could better manage its resources. Staffing and other general costs could be contained and better utilised. Eventually the AEC could coordinate all elections, Federal, State and referenda, reducing the chance of overlap.
Having pre-prescribed dates for all elections might bring huge savings.

Appendix sixteen | Citizens' Parliament (CP)

Old Parliament House, 6 - 9 Feb 2009
Agenda - 26 Jan 09

Aims

- Provide the space and opportunity for dialogue and deliberation on: 'How can Australia's political system be strengthened to serve us better?'
- Enable participants to explore different ways to achieve this through deliberative processes that facilitate participant understanding of different views, learning new ideas, testing assumptions, identifying values, weighing options and developing priorities.
- Provide the opportunity for participants to develop a final report of their recommendations, and to have that report heard and seriously considered by those in positions of influence.

Hosts: Fred Chaney & Lowitja O'Donoghue – Co-Chairs
Citizens'Parliament

Lead Facilitators: Janette Hartz-Karp and Max Hardy

Event Management: Vickianne Lane and Les Buchanan

Theme Team Coordinator: Rachel Armstrong

Coordinating Facilitator: Kath Fisher

Report Coordinator: Dora Marinova

IT Support: Eric and Kim Ling.

AM/PM Participants arrive at the University of Canberra Accommodation

Tasks prior to CP starting - a) Submit Additional Ideas; b) Opinion Charting; b) Survey

FRIDAY (DAY 1) 6TH FEB 2009

Aim - Understanding what we want to achieve together at the CP

IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBERS

- 2.30pm Welcome
- 2.50 Official address
- 3.10 Overview of what we have done already; what we want to achieve and how
- 3.20 Short presentations by CPs outlining the prioritised online proposals
- 3.50 Afternoon Tea

IN DINING ROOM

- 4.20 Small group introductions and dialogue - what we want to achieve together
- 4.50 Individual/group input to computers - comments, changes, additions to Online Proposals
- 5.40 Small group dialogue - how this deliberation could be different
- 6.10 Closing Remarks
- 6.15 Close and distribution of Day 1 Preliminary Report

SATURDAY (DAY 2) 7TH FEB 2009

Aim - Broadening our Perspectives

IN DINING ROOM

- 8.30am Recap of Day 1 and Overview of Day 2
- 8.40 World Café
 a) When our democracy is at its best, what is it we appreciate?
 b) How can it be more like this more often?
 c) What can be learnt from this?
- 9.40 1st Panel Discussion - Commentary on proposals - pros, cons, gaps, issues of interest
- 10.10 Developing questions for 1st Panel - concerns, clarifications, views to test out
- 10.30 Morning Tea
- 11.00 1st Panel responses to key themes/questions
- 11.35 2nd Panel Discussion - Additional options to consider
- 12.05pm Developing questions for 1st Panel - concerns, clarifications, views to test out; and
 Creative thinking - developing additional options to consider
- 12.50 Lunch
- 1.35 2nd Panel responds to key themes/questions and additional creative options
- 2.25 Reflective Conversation - overall reflection on proposals thus far
- 2.50 Open Space - CPs select and discuss the issues/ideas they want to develop further

Outside, or in areas in the House outside the Dining Room

- 3.30 Afternoon Tea
- 4.00 Open Space groups continue

IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBERS

- 4.50 Welcome to Old Parliament House and its background
- 4.55 Plenary Feedback - highlights from Open Space teams
- 5.25 Closing remarks
- 5.30 Close and distribution of Day 2 Preliminary Report

SUNDAY (DAY 3) 8TH FEB 2009

Aim - Determining what is most important to us

IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBERS

- 8.30am Welcome, recap of day 2 & overview of day 3
- 8.40 Small group Dialogue - Progress thus far - what's exciting, challenging, possible
- 9.00 Question and Answer session on any Ideas from the Combined List of Proposals

IN DINING ROOM

- 9.30 Small Group Deliberation - Has anything been left out, needing amendment, more information?
- 10.00 What do you believe should be the characteristics of a healthy political system?
- 10.30 Morning Tea
- 11.00 3rd Panel - Responds to new ideas, amendments, further information requested
- 11.40 Prioritisation - Selecting the Top 10 from our Combined List of Proposals
- 11.55 Prioritisation - Which characteristics are most important to a healthy political system?
- 12.10 Fishbowl - Which of our proposals come to mind as best reflecting our #1 characteristic?
- 12.35 Prioritisation - Which proposals best reflect our #1 characteristic of a healthy democracy
- 12.55 Lunch
- 1.40 Small group Dialogue - Which proposals come to mind as best reflecting #2 characteristic?
- 2.00 Prioritisation - Proposals most reflecting our #2 characteristic of a healthy democracy
- 2.10 Small group Dialogue - Which proposals come to mind as being our most innovative?
- 2.30 Prioritisation - Our most innovative proposals
- 2.45 Small group Dialogue - Which proposals would be the easiest to implement
- 3.05 Prioritisation - Our easiest to implement initiatives
- 3.20 Afternoon Tea
- 3.50 Small group Dialogue - Which proposals would be the most important in the long term?
- 4.10 Prioritisation - Our Most Important Proposals in the Long Term
- 4.25 Quiet Reflection / Time-Out
- 4.45 Discussion of Model of Final Report Recommendations, suggestions and changes
- 5.20 Eliciting CP Volunteers to present the Final Report Recommendations
- 5.25 Closing remarks
- 5.30 Close and Distribution of Day 3 Preliminary Report

MONDAY (DAY 4) – 9TH FEB 2009

Aim - Consolidating and Delivering our Recommendations

IN DINING ROOM

- 8.30am Welcome, recap of day 3 and overview of day 4
- 8.40 Distribution of Draft Final Recommendations Report - read/clarify/amend?
- 8.55 Small group dialogue - Highlights, lowlights, insights
- 9.30 Distribution of Final Report Recommendations - explanation of any changes
- 9.35 CP volunteer representatives practice presentation of Final Report Recommendations
- 10.05 Morning Tea

IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHAMBERS

- 10.40 Welcome to guests - MPs media
- 10.45 Presentation of Final Report to government representatives and media
- 11.05 Opportunity for government to respond
- 11.25 Thank you to guests and CPs, and depart the Assembly Chambers

IN DINING ROOM

- 11.40 Small groups- Next steps - how WE can move forward, keeping 'we, the people' at the forefront
- 12.10 Debrief - Expectations Vs reality; possible impacts; learnings about self, others, democracy
- 12.45 Lunch and Opinion Charting
- 2.00 Final survey
- 2.10 CP response - cameo experiences of the CP - e.g. through skit, poem, essay, song
- 2.20 Short video of experiences of the CP
- 2.35 Finals words and thank you
- 2.45 Close and Distribution of Day 4 Report