
newDEMOCRACY

*Deliberation Process for Rural Councils:
Constrained Time and Budget Model*

Process Design Part 2 of 2

Operations

** newDemocracy is an independent, non-partisan research and development organisation. We aim to discover, develop, demonstrate, and promote complementary alternatives which will restore trust in public decision making.*

1. Operational roles and responsibilities

The newDemocracy Foundation approaches our work as a collaboration with the government, agency or council which auspices the project. Our experience is that this is the most effective way to explore how to rebuild trust in government decision making. By working in partnership, we can apply the principles of meaningful deliberation to a variety of models, using this as real-life research and development to create a fundamental change in how we do democracy.

In any collaboration, there must be distinct roles and responsibilities assigned. For the purposes of the any project originating from this design, newDemocracy is able to offer advice and clarification. However, this process is designed to be low cost (zero cost) and requires Council to take on added responsibility.

Communication, administrative, technical, promotional and other logistical support will be provided by Council. This will be coordinated by the nominated project management liaison within Council. It is crucial that allocation of necessary internal resources is considered and agreed by Council before the project commences.

Further to this, a skilled facilitator, experienced with deliberative methods, will be required. newDemocracy always recommends that due to experimental nature of our deliberative projects, that it is advantageous that the facilitator be well versed in newDemocracy-style processes.

A summary of the core roles and responsibilities for each participant in the process is outlined below.

Participant	Roles and responsibilities
Council (elected)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endorse and support the project. • Participate in pre-commencement planning sessions to explore fine-grain project detail and provide crucial input to the final process design. • Actively advocate for the use of a deliberative process to provide valuable input to Council's long-term planning. • Act as a conduit for stakeholders and interested community members by providing information and advice about the process.
Council (staff)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide unedited databases and/or records through which to generate a pool of potential participants for which the random recruitment and be conducted. • Support other face-to-face recruitment mechanisms. • Develop and deliver a communication plan to support the project throughout. • Develop and produce the participants briefing book. • Provide responses to requests for information made by the panellists in a factual and non-leading manner. • All administrative, technical, catering and logistical support required to deliver project.
newDemocracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed process design and advice to ensure the project is undertaken with public confidence and transparency. • Support for all elements of the recruitment process including hosting of online registrations, random stratification, selection, confirmation and orientation. • Detailed collaboration with project facilitator(s) to support best-practice design and delivery of sessions. • Advice and support for the coordination of the stakeholder engagement and submission process. • Communication and media support to Council as required.
Independent Facilitator(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboratively design and deliver the deliberative project to the brief of this project design and in co-ordination with newDemocracy. • Develop all necessary materials required for deliberation.

Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critically engage with and scrutinise the information provided by Council, presenters, submitters and other participants to reach consensus (or group consent) positions on the remit/options given. • Reflect openly, honestly and broadly as a local resident, taking into consideration personal life experiences, gained knowledge and the perspectives of the whole community to contribute to the deliberative process. • Be respectful of the group and collaborate with other participants fulsomely and with integrity. • Liaise with Council and newDemocracy before speaking with the media about the project. • Attend the two, day sessions and participate in self-directed and collaborative inquiry and activities outside the meetings.
Stakeholders, submitters, expert witnesses and other presenters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide solutions or responses and nominate a diverse range of speakers and information source for the consideration of the participants in deliberation. • Explain other issues, ideas and proposals in a clear manner to assist the panel in their deliberations. • Summarise existing evidence and provide a viewpoint or experience in relation to this evidence; and where advocating a position, disclose any personal interest or potential bias (perceived or actual).

2. Media engagement

The role of the media in telling the story of the event is crucial and Council will be encouraged to reach out to local outlets early to outline the project. This should be continued throughout the project, with an emphasis on sharing the experience and processes being undertaken. It is also important that the Mayor and Councillors visibly endorse the process at the outset before any results are known. Prior projects demonstrate that those willing to take the risk at the outset of very publicly agreeing to listen to any result earn greater scope for action when the recommendations are presented.

A thorough communications plan should be developed and agreed prior to commencement in order to best support the project throughout every phase of operation. This is critical for the project and due consideration needs to be given to ensuring it can be adequately resourced.

3. Costing Estimate

This process has been designed to be the lowest possible cost while still maintaining deliberative and operational integrity. The key costs, as outlined below, include the retainment of a skilled deliberative democracy experienced facilitator and the participant per diems.

newDemocracy provides this design and advisory support free of charge.

DIRECT COSTS		
Item	Cost	Notes
Printing and distribution	\$2,000	Allows for production of jury briefing material and limited amount of recruitment and supporting materials.
Database access costs	\$0	Assumes Council compilation and provision.
Face-to-face recruitment costs	\$0	Assumes Council can waive any fees which would otherwise be associated with temporary stalls or similar.
Participant per diems	\$6,000-10,000	30-50 participants x \$200 pp.
Facilitator	[9 days at Council agreed rate] ~	This is an estimate only and may vary slightly given the unique nature of this process design: as a guide we have allowed for 4 days facilitation, 4 days planning and 4 days for workshop component
Catering	\$3,000-5,000	30-50 x 2 days x \$50pppd.
Venue hire	\$0	Assumes Council venues (with AV capability and table rounds) are available.
newDemocracy expenses	\$0	Support provided pro-bono.

4. Tasks and Milestones

Stage	Stage outline
Pre-Event Stage 1 10 weeks prior	<p>Design, Preparation and Recruitment</p> <p>Council and newDemocracy agree and approve necessary materials and decisions. newDemocracy advises on recruitment of the Participants and Facilitator. Participants receive their information kits and insight into the process. Stakeholder Reference Group is established and nominate their speakers.</p> <p>1. Kick off</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Recruit facilitator(s) b. Finalise contracts (including their publication) c. Review outcomes from engagement to date d. Agree timeframes, milestones and responsibilities e. Recruitment process agreed and approved f. Finalise venue bookings g. Finalise Stakeholder Reference Group target membership (SRG) h. First draft of information kit (contents, structure, etc. for comment)
Pre-Event Stage 2 8 weeks prior	<p>2. Start recruitment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Invite design and approval b. Council announcement c. SRG invitations sent (concurrent with announcement: this document to accompany it) d. Information kit production and approval – completed 4 weeks prior to Day 1 e. Invitation distribution – completed 6 weeks before Day 1 f. Stakeholder workshops g. SRG meetings h. SRG speaker nomination i. Conclude RSVP period for participation – 3 weeks prior to Day 1

Stage	Stage outline
Pre-event Stage 3 3 weeks prior	<p>3. Complete recruitment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Participant confirmation emails – 3 weeks prior to Day 1 b. Participant confirmation calls – 2-3 weeks prior to Day 1 c. Information kit distribution – 2 weeks prior to Day 1 d. SRG speakers booked for Day 1 e. Finalise Government speakers for Day 1
Day 1	<p>Introduction, critical thinking and principles</p> <p>Participants meet for the first time, they begin walking through deliberative principles, critical thinking, and how the room will eventually come to a group decision. They start their immersion in the topic by hearing from Council and SRG nominated speakers (3-4).</p> <p>Tasks and milestones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Exercises include: what do we know, what are our key insights, do we need any fact checking, what more do we need to know? b. Participants break into groups to discuss initial learnings, then identify further questions for speakers c. Potential inclusion of a speed-dialogue session with speakers d. Groups share among themselves key insights and learnings – and focus on what new questions are now emerging now they have learned more. e. Participants make any fact checking requests f. Close of Day 1 the group has completed their information consolidation before Day 2’s work on finding agreement.
Day 2	<p>Option consideration and common ground</p> <p>Participants finish their content dive – returning to small groups to now focus on the presented options and seek common ground. Participants begin the process of making decisions together – they identify the strongest option while at the same time developing any recommendations or original adjustments to improve their ability to find common ground.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Exercises include: What is the support for the different presented options? What are your initial recommendations and why? Is there any overlap? Are there any adjustments that could be made to improve support? b. Participants begin the day mixing groups and discussing support for the presented options – with the end goal of finding a common ground option. c. Tasking with the question ‘What needs to happen for you to support this option?’ Groups work to coalesce around an option or make recommendations to improve support.

Stage	Stage outline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. The group has the option to generate original recommendations – demonstrating clarity of intent and outlining the information they used to support this decision. e. The group is finally polled to measure support for each presented option and any original recommendations written into the final report. f. Report is presented to the Mayor and Councillors. <p>The goal is to have a document people own so if they ask for extra time as a requirement – we view that as a reasonable request.</p>