### Appendix A. An Overview of Public Participation Methods

(From Primer on Public Involvement by François-Pierre Gauvin and Julia Abelson, 2006.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens' Juries</td>
<td>Dated in 1969, several citizens' juries have been used in the USA under the Jefferson Center.</td>
<td>Since 1974, several citizens' juries have been held in Great Britain, Australia and India. The issue was open in Great Britain, Australia and India.</td>
<td>They are informed about the issue. More careful examination of the issue. Provides opportunities to individuals participating.</td>
<td>Exclusive - only few in each jury. Limited to a select few jurors. Potential problems evolve in initial phases of preparation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Example
A randomly selected group of 12 citizens meet routinely (e.g., four times per year) to consider and discuss issues and make decisions. The panel acts as “sounding boards” for governing authorities, with regional health authorities responsible for prioritizing different policy issues like environmental health and transport planning. People benefit from experience with panel members, earthy communication, and opportunities to participate in discussions with groups. This method allows for innovative ideas and active participation.

### Limitations
- Some are non-deliberative (e.g., mail or phone panels).
- Many take a survey.
- Few panels are sounding boards for governing authorities.
- Use is often health-related.

### Strengths
- Smaller size of individual groups.
- People benefit from experience with panel members.
- Earthy communication.
- Opportunities to participate in discussions with groups.

### Description
- Method used over the last two decades in many countries: Great Britain, Germany, Denmark, and Canada. In Canada’s four public panels in Canada, people benefit from experience with panel members, earthy communication, and opportunities to participate in discussions with groups. This method allows for innovative ideas and active participation.

### Key references on citizen panels:

---

### Additional Notes
- Used for the last two decades in many countries: Great Britain, Germany, Denmark, and Canada. In Canada’s four public panels in Canada, people benefit from experience with panel members, earthy communication, and opportunities to participate in discussions with groups. This method allows for innovative ideas and active participation.

---

**Appendix A. An Overview of Public Participation Methods (cont'd)**
### Method Description

**Limitations**
- Recruitment method may not represent the opinions of individual groups.
- Multiple conferences required to ensure broad representation.
- Significant resources required for organizing.
- Educating the public requires an extended process.
- Exclusivity process meaning the conference topic provided a unique opportunity for the citizen panel to express their ideas and acutely participate.

**Examples**
- Genetic Modified Organisms (1999)
- Identity (1993)
- Human Genome (1998)
- Food Intoxication (1993)
- Technoethics (1987)
- Aquaculture and Genetic Engineering (1993)
- Xenotransplantation in Canada (2001)

**Strengths**
- Small size of individual groups.
- Multiple conferences providing automated and self-informing scenarios.
- Significant resource required to ensure broad representation.
- Educating the public requires an extended process.
- Exclusivity process meaning the conference topic provided a unique opportunity for the citizen panel to express their ideas and acutely participate.

**Strengths**
- Useful method for clarifying complex issues.
- Significant resource required to ensure broad representation.
- Educating the public requires an extended process.
- Exclusivity process meaning the conference topic provided a unique opportunity for the citizen panel to express their ideas and acutely participate.

### Key References on Consensus Conferences

- **Danish Board of Technology**. [www.tekno.dk](http://www.tekno.dk).
- **LOKA Institute**. [www.loka.org/pages/worldpanels.htm](http://www.loka.org/pages/worldpanels.htm).

### Consensus Conferences

Since 1987, several consensus conferences have been held in Denmark. Consensus conferences were developed by the Danish Board of Technology and are organized by the Danish Board of Technology. Several examples of consensus conferences include:

- **Xenotransplantation in Canada (2001)**
- **Agriculture and Genetic Engineering (1993)**
- **Food Intoxication (1993)**
- **Technoethics (1987)**
- **Human Genome (1998)**
- **Identity (1993)**
- **GM Food (1999)**

**A few examples:**
- Japan: The Neutrons, New Zealand: Women, Norway: South Africa, Canada, Australia, Germany, Israel, and the USA. General trends in Denmark, Canada, and elsewhere.
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An overview of Public Participation Methods (cont'd)
**Key references on scenario workshops:**


- European Commission. Scenario Workshop (EASW) 1992-1993. Used in Denmark, Italy, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Austria and Switzerland.


- EUROPTA project 1998-1999. Developed by the Danish Board of Technology.

---

**Method Description**

- Generate dialogue, collaboration and planning between every actor.
- Small size of individual groups allows for innovative ideas and active participation.
- Selection of panel members is in the interest of the participants.
- Selection of panel members is not exclusive, thus still only a few experts and citizens.
- Using the scenarios as a basis for discussions.
- Before the workshop, a few scenarios are presented to inform the participants.
- Between 24 to 32 participants come together for a two day meeting (decision makers, experts and citizens).

---

**Examples**


---

**Limitations**

- Can be difficult to generate neutral and complete briefing material.
- Process requires significant resources and intensive time.
- Selection of panel members is not exclusive, thus still only a few experts and citizens.

---

**Strengths**

- Small size of individual groups.
- Selection of panel members is not exclusive, thus still only a few experts and citizens.
- Selection of panel members is in the interest of the participants.

---

**Deviations**

- Used in Denmark, Italy, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Austria and Switzerland.
- Developed by the Danish Board of Technology.
- EUROPTA project 1998-1999. Developed by the Danish Board of Technology.
### Limitations

- The result is not firm because it depends on the result of the deliberation

### Strengths

- The result is based on the will of the people
- It is possible to measure the result of deliberation
- It is possible to measure the result of deliberation

### Description

- Involves polling the people again, and finally, pollining small groups of citizens (50 to 100 people) selected from a random sample. The process requires significant resources and time, and there is a need for further research. The result is not firm because it depends on the result of the deliberation.

### Examples

- In Great Britain, for the future
- Deliberative polls were used:
  - Daylight saving
  - Voter turnout
  - Inclusion of the term "I" in the poll
  - Small size of individual groups
  - Expanding proportional representation
  - Small size of individual groups
  - Expanding proportional representation
  - Small size of individual groups
  - Expanding proportional representation
  - Small size of individual groups
  - Expanding proportional representation
  - Small size of individual groups
  - Expanding proportional representation
  - Small size of individual groups
  - Expanding proportional representation

### Key references on deliberative polls:

The Canadian Policy Research Network has been using the Citizens' dialogue methodology since the mid-1990s.

A citizens' dialogue brings together a group of citizens that small size of individual groups. Although sample size is large, it can be difficult to generate neutral and comprehensive briefing material. Moreover, the organizers may not allow for innovative ideas and active participation.

Limitations:
- Small size of individual groups
- It can be difficult to generate neutral and comprehensive briefing material
- Although sample size is large, it can be difficult to generate neutral and comprehensive briefing material.

Strengths:
- Gives participants an opportunity to listen to other views, enlarge and possibly change their own point of view.
- Provides information in the form of a workbook or guide that represents several perspectives on an issue, lending a layer of complexity and struggle to the discussion.
- Small group deliberation
- The group moderator encourages equal participation.
- Information on the issue is available in a workbook or guide that includes a variety of perspectives.

Examples:
- Citizens' Dialogue on the Long-term Management of Used Nuclear Fuel
- Citizens' Dialogue on the Kind of Canada We Want
- Citizens' Dialogue on the Future of Health Care in Canada
- Asking Citizens a Voice in Health Care Policy in Canada, British Medical Journal 2003; 326; 1031-1033.

Method Description:
- Policy development can be difficultly informed from public consultation steps. It requires a layer of consultation and an opportunity to listen to other views, enlarge and possibly change your own point of view.
- The group moderator encourages equal participation.
- The process requires significant resources and intensive preparation.
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