

# CTP Citizens' Jury Strategy – last weekend

## Purpose of this paper

To provide the Jury with an overview of the approach for the last weekend of the CTP Citizens' Jury.

## Purpose of the last weekend

The approved CTP Citizens Jury Strategy document states that the second Jury will be convened to consider the following question;

*What CTP model best meets the objectives as defined by Jury 1? What's important to communicate to the community about the scheme?*

The strategy also states that;

*"The Jury will explore the different models [developed by the Stakeholder Reference Group] and their suitability under the objectives, including having the opportunity to examine witnesses about their perspectives on the models, why witnesses feel that models do or don't deliver on the objectives. Jurors will evaluate each option against the criteria from Jury Part 1 also jointly determining whether some criteria need to be weighted to give them their due importance - i.e. do a multi criteria decision analysis."*

At the SRG meeting on 4 December during discussions with the SRG about the process for the last weekend, a number of members raised concerns about the appropriateness of the multi criteria analysis approach. They cited concerns about whether converting the Jury's 'objectives' to 'criteria' would keep the 'faith' with the Jury's report. Specifically notes from the SRG meeting state that the SRG felt that *"summary documents/criteria need to faithfully reflect the jury's wording as provided in their report and that the context of the full jury report should be taken into account in the jury's assessment."* democracyCo reviewed the approach in light of this feedback and agreed that using the MCA approach did risk changing the Jury's work (in the process of changing the Jury's 'objectives' into 'criteria') and hence would not be appropriate. As a consequence and in agreement with the SRG, we will not use multi criteria decision analysis on the final weekend.

As the SRG have developed and refined the models during the end of 2017 / beginning of 2018, it has become clear that the 4 models, while different, share some broad characteristics. Model A & B share some similar characteristics, as do Model C & D. As a result of this, democracyCo will support the Jury in choosing a model using these 'clusters'.

We propose the following broad approach:

- Jurors have the opportunity to read about and reflect on the models independently, before they convene on the 24<sup>th</sup>.
- Two days of facilitated jury process, including requiring the Jury to include what's important for the government to communicate to the public about the Jury.
- Models to be presented / explained by the scheme designer, Geoff Atkins (Finity) and the Actuary, Peter McCarthy (EY).

- SRG members to be available and present to provide advice / their views to Jury members about which model they feel best meets the Jury's objectives. This advice is to be provided only if individual jury members seek this advice.
- Two stage voting process.
  - Day 1: Jury will choose one model from the cluster of A & B and one model from the cluster C & D which best meet their objectives. The successful two models from this process will be the only two models which will be considered on Day 2.<sup>1</sup>
  - Day 2: Jury will choose the preferred final model from the two chosen on Day 1.
- A process which includes, personal (individual) consideration, group deliberation and group consensus / voting.
- Decision 'rules' – which determine what constitutes a decision
- Jurors will be unable to suggest their own 'juror model'.

## Methodology

### Work for jurors, pre-Jury

A booklet will be put together (by democracyCo & the SRG) and provided to the Jury 10 days before they reconvene.

Its contents will include:

- Front page – reminder about the role / remit / authority
- Explanation (from Geoff) about why objectives haven't been included in the model designs and how this feedback to government will be managed – ref Objective: Encourage people to drive safely.
- Each model is described in full with any notes from Actuary and Scheme designer.
- SRG Reflections - Paragraphs (200 word summary + additional material if members provide it) from the SRG summarising their views on the model/s – to be separately provided later
- Full copy of the Jury report from 2017
- An outline of the 2 final jury days – which sets the expectation that they are 'decision focused' and outlines the decision rule (this document)
- A one page reflection worksheet – for jurors to use as they work through the models.

---

<sup>1</sup> NOTE – this process was changed following a suggestion made by the representatives of the Bar Association and Law Society and supported by other members following the meeting on the 12 February. democracyCo also felt that the proposal from the Bar Association and Law Society was a better approach than that proposed by us.

## Final weekend at a glance

The following provides a summary overview of the process for the weekend.

### Saturday

- Jury learn about and deliberate on all 4 models and the characteristics which cluster certain models together.
- Jury choose two models using a ballot at the end of the day.
- Ballot scrutineered by Jury and SRG members

### Sunday

- Jury consider and deliberate on the two models they voted for on Saturday - including clarification from Actuary / Scheme Designer and SRG (if they wish).
- Jury vote on their final preferred model.
- Jury write their report.
- Jury present their report to the Chief Minister.

#### DECISION RULE

- democracyCo and the SRG have agreed that the Jury will adopt a “majority rule” for the final weekend – the selection of a model which has a majority, that is, more than 50% of the votes. This will be explained to the Jury when they reconvene on the 24<sup>th</sup> March

## Day 1: 24<sup>th</sup> March

Key outcome of the day: At the end of the day, the Jury will have agreed on which two models best meet their objectives (one from each cluster of models.)

Time	Session	Notes / who
9am	Arrival & Re-entry	democracyCo
Mid morning	Intro to all four models – equal time allocated to each model explanation	Geoff / Peter / democracyCo
Lunch	<i>During lunch and morning tea SRG can talk with jurors if approached by a Juror .</i>	
Early afternoon	Jury consider each of the 4 models in depth by breaking into 4 groups and rotating through each model. Supported by Geoff / Peter. Jurors can seek advice from the SRG if they wish.	democracyCo.
4.30pm	<p>Jury will be asked to participate in a poll using a ballot paper.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; text-align: center;"> <p>EXAMPLE BALLOT PAPER DAY 1 – COMPLETE BOTH LINES</p> <p>Circle one only:    Model A    or    Model B</p> <p>Circle one only:    Model C    or    Model D</p> </div> <p>Ballot papers will be numbered and placed in a box.            Votes will be counted by 3 juror scrutineers along with any member of the SRG who wishes to observe. Jurors will be notified of the models which have been chosen to work on during Day 2.</p>	
5pm	Close of day.	

## Day 2: 25<sup>th</sup> March

Key outcome of the day: At the end of the day, the Jury will have agreed on which model it prefers & will be able to explain why.

9am	Welcome and re-entry	
	Discussion with jury on the 2 remaining models	Jury / democracyCo / Peter / Geoff
Mid morning	Jury consider each of the 2 models in depth by breaking into 2 groups. Supported by Geoff / Peter. Jurors can seek advice from the SRG if they wish.	Jury / democracyCo
Late morning	Jury vote on model which best meets their objectives.	Jury / democracyCo
LUNCH		
Early afternoon	<p>Writing</p> <p>Jury breaks into 4 groups:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Outlines the chosen model, and why it was chosen and outlines the key things that the community need to know about the scheme.</li> <li>2. Outlines the model not chosen on Day 2, and why it was not chosen</li> <li>3. Outlines the models not chosen (Day 1) and why</li> <li>4. Writes the preamble, including the process undertaken to arrive at a consensus view</li> </ol> <p>If jurors have abstained from voting, they are required to write a minority report <b>together</b> – which outlines why they abstained. This is limited to half a page.</p>	Jury / democracyCo
Mid afternoon	Final walk through of the report.	Jury / democracyCo
Late afternoon	<p>Jury conduct a reflection on their time together.</p> <p>Jury present final report to the Chief Ministers proxy.</p>	Jury / democracyCo Representative of the Chief Minister

On the Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> March a small delegation of Jurors will meet with the Chief Minister who is unfortunately unavailable on Sunday. Jurors will be chosen using a ‘merit based selection’ process – conducted by their peers.