

## Appendix 3

Table 1. Purpose, context, and participants

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<b>CONSULTATION</b>							
<a href="#">Connecting to Congress Online Town Halls on the Covid-19 emergency</a> <sup>1</sup>	Connecting to Congress organizes single-issue, non-partisan, online town halls. In response to the COVID-19 crisis, it uses deliberative town halls to share information between Members and their constituents and help identify concerns and issues in the Member's district.	Oklahoma, USA	April 2020	Academic institution	<a href="#">Connecting to Congress</a> (research on constituent engagement) at the <a href="#">Institute for Democratic Engagement and Accountability (IDEA)</a> at Ohio State University (an academic institution)	<a href="#">Ohio State University</a> and the <a href="#">Democracy Fund</a>	Nearly 13,500 constituents participated in 8 deliberative online town halls

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<a href="#">Deliberative Consultation on Trade-offs Related to Using 'CovidSafe' Contact Tracing Technology</a> <sup>2</sup>	In April 2020, the Australian government launched the COVIDSafe app. This application constitutes a tool for public health authorities to slow the spread of COVID-19 in Australia by facilitating the identification and containment of outbreaks. The application identifies people that may have been in contact with someone who tested positive for the virus. This technology's usefulness depends on a high volume of users, but it raises concerns about surveillance, discrimination, and data privacy. The government tried to address these by adopting legislation that makes it an offense to require an individual to have the application. Considering the trade-offs related to this contact tracing technology, the purpose of this deliberative initiative was to provide recommendations for government, agencies, and public and private organizations on how the application should be used in Australia.	New South Wales, Australia	June 2020	Academic institution	The <a href="#">Australian Centre for Health Engagement, Evidence &amp; Values</a> at the University of Wollongong (an academic institution) with the NHMRC Centre of Research Excellence in Emerging Infectious Diseases (CREID) and the University of Sydney	Australian National Health and Medical Research Council	43 participants. Half were recruited from a pool of participants of a previous study examining the preferences of NSW residents for technologically enhanced communicable disease surveillance. The other half were selected from this pool, based on representative socio-demographic characteristics (including gender and age) from a pool of NSW residents.

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<a href="#">Scottish Crowdsourcing Exercise "Coronavirus (COVID-19): framework for decision making"</a> <sup>3</sup>	The Scottish Government launched a digital platform as part of a public engagement exercise in which it sought public input on the approaches and principles that would guide decision-making related to transitioning out of the coronavirus (COVID-19) lockdown arrangements.	Scotland, UK	May 2020	Regional government	<a href="#">Scottish Government</a> (a regional government)	Scottish Government	11,692 registered users, 3,274 of whom submitted ideas and comments. The digital platform that was used ( <a href="#">Dialogue</a> ) employs an open call for participants. As a result, respondents were self-selected and did not represent a random sample of the population. Participants were not required to provide any demographic information.
<a href="#">Climate Assembly UK and the Covid-19 crisis</a>	The <a href="#">Climate Assembly UK</a> was convened by six Select Committees of the House of Commons to discuss how the UK should reach its net-zero greenhouse gas emissions target. Following the COVID-19 crisis, it conducted a <a href="#">discussion of the impacts of the pandemic on climate action</a> .	UK	May 2020	National government	<a href="#">Involve</a> (a non-profit non-governmental organization)	UK Government	110 citizens randomly selected to represent the population in terms of age, gender, educational qualification, ethnicity, geography, and attitudes to climate change.

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<a href="#">#LockDownDebate: Rapid online deliberation on contact tracing</a>	<p>This project aimed to test a methodology that would help integrate public deliberation into decision-making processes in an ever-changing context that requires rapid public input. Its four objectives were the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Influencing research content by defining the relevant questions that need to be explored to inform the design of policy around contact tracing</li> <li>2. Generating timely research data and contributing to the evidence base on relevant public perceptions and values in relation to contact tracing in time to inform policy making and design</li> <li>3. Influencing research strategy by demonstrating to research commissioners that inclusive, deliberative research can be done online in policy-relevant timescales</li> <li>4. Testing and learning from an approach to conducting deliberation online, asynchronously, and under shorter timescales than typical deliberation</li> </ol>	UK	May-June 2020	For-profit business	<p><a href="#">Traverse</a> (a for-profit business), with the <a href="#">Ada Lovelace Institute</a> (an independent research institute), <a href="#">involve</a> (a non-profit non-governmental organization), and <a href="#">Bang the Table</a> (a for-profit business).</p>	Non-governmental organizations	<p>28 people participated. The recruitment process relied on an open invitation to local online groups (e.g., mutual aid groups, local resident forums). Participants were selected from that pool based on criteria such as age, ethnicity, approximated social grade, rural and urban, and gender. 54 citizens expressed interest, and from that pool, 31 invitations were sent and 29 accepted to take part. 1 dropped out.</p>

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<a href="#">Citizens' Panel – Planning the West Midlands' Recovery</a>	The West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) commissioned a citizens' panel to address the economic and social impacts of the COVID-19 public health crisis. The panel sought citizens' input to inform and guide the priorities for the region's recovery.	West Midlands, UK	June-July 2020	Local government	<a href="#">Britain Thinks</a> (a for-profit business)	West Midlands Combined Authority (government)	36 people that represented a cross-section of the West Midlands. Professional market research recruiters selected 27 panellists from Constituent Authorities, and nine from Non-Constituent Authorities. The following criteria were used to ensure the diversity of the panel: gender, age, socio-economic group, ethnicity, health, location, life stage, employment, voting history/intention, shielded.
<a href="#">Oregon Citizens' Assembly on Covid-19 Recovery</a>	To create an opportunity for citizens to come to a considered judgement on a path beyond the coronavirus pandemic and the economic crisis.	Oregon, USA	7 2-hour sessions July-August 2020	Community-based organisations	<a href="#">Healthy Democracy</a> (a community-based organisation) and <a href="#">Oregon's Kitchen Table</a>	Non-governmental organization (non-profit)	40 citizens randomly selected to reflect the state in terms of age, gender, place of residence, race and ethnicity, political party, education, and level of political engagement. 4 dropped out.

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<a href="#">Dialogue and Deliberative Workshops on Covid-19 and the NHS (National Health Service)</a>	To explore the concerns of the citizens and their views on the tensions and trade-offs related to measures that could be put in place in response to the pandemic with the aim of informing the National Health Service (NHS) decision-making process as it managed a second wave of COVID-19 cases.	London, UK	June-August 2020	National health service	<a href="#">NHS England and Improvement (London Region)</a> (a health service)	National health service	58 participants attended the first workshop and 61 attended the second one. Participants in the dialogue stage were drawn from the 100 Londoners who took part in the <a href="#">OneLondon Citizens' Summit</a> to ensure that participants reflected the population, views on health and care data, and the local NHS geographic divisions. Participants in the deliberative stage were recruited to reflect London's diversity in terms of gender, age, socio-economic category, ethnicity, caring responsibility, and health and social care usage. They were also representatives of the local NHS geographic divisions.
<a href="#">Online Public Dialogues on Covid-19 Winter Preparedness</a>	The potential risks posed by a new wave of coronavirus cases in the UK over winter 2020-21 represented a challenging situation for public officials. The purpose of these public dialogues was to explore the public's views and priorities for dealing with a new wave, their trust in science and the government, and their expectations for the winter.	UK	June-July 2020	Scientific organisation ( <a href="#">Academy of Medical Sciences</a> )	<a href="#">Ipsos MORI Public Affairs</a> (a for-profit business hired by the Academy of Medical Sciences)	UK government	36 people participated in 3 3-hour online workshops. Each workshop had 12 people recruited to reflect a particular group: the general public, vulnerable groups, minority groups (people with black, Asian, and minority ethnic backgrounds).

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<a href="#">Nantes Métropole Citizens' Convention</a>	The COVID-19 pandemic has changed the way of life of many citizens. A wide variety of economic and social measures to address the crises created by the pandemic have been proposed. However, these proposals reveal many tensions about the kind of direction the city should pursue. The objective of the citizens' convention is thus to seek a broader understanding of the citizens' perspective. This deliberative process aims to understand how citizens are experiencing the crisis and how it has impacted their ability to move forward.	Nantes, France	November 2020-February 2021	Nantes Métropole region (local government)	<a href="#">Missions Publiques</a> (a for-profit business)	Nantes Métropole region (local government)	80 citizens selected to represent the diversity of the region, selected mainly from respondents to a telephone survey on the health crisis. The survey firm selected a representative panel from respondents who expressed an interest, taking into account demographic, geographic and socio-economic criteria, as well as different perceptions of the health crisis.

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<a href="#">Scottish Parliament Citizens' Panel on Covid-19</a>	Health measures that impacted the everyday life of all people were implemented under emergency powers. As a result, they were often implemented without consultation and with limited parliamentary oversight] To mitigate this issue, the Scottish Parliament's Covid-19 Committee convened a citizens' panel to ensure that its oversight was informed by the experiences of people in Scotland. The purpose of the panel was to address: "What priorities should shape the Scottish Government's approach to Covid-19 restrictions and strategy in 2021?"	Scotland, UK	January-February 2021	Regional government	The Scottish Parliament's Committee Engagement Unit and the not-for profit <a href="#">Sortition Foundation</a>	Scottish government	20 citizens were randomly selected based on the 2011 Scottish Census data. The sample was stratified to create a representative panel based on gender, age, region, ethnicity, and the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD), an index used to identify the areas where people are experiencing disadvantages in various facets of their lives.



Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<a href="#">Citizens' Assembly on restrictions and recommendations in response to the COVID-19 pandemic</a>	The goal was to research the evolution of the participants' attitudes concerning containment measures and the extent to which expert hearings influenced them.	Finland	March 2021	Academic institution	<a href="#">University of Turku</a>	Academy of Finland COVID-19 Special Funding	70 people had completed participation throughout the two-day event. An invitation was mailed to a random sample (n=6000) of Finnish people aged 18 to 80. Potential participants were required to fill out a recruitment survey online. 261 (4.4 percent) people completed the survey. Of these, 163 (62.5 percent) declared that they would volunteer as participants. All were invited, and 80 individuals confirmed their participation. On the first day, 74 people showed up. Two participants dropped out during the first day, and another two failed to show up on the second day.

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<a href="#">Conference on the Future of Europe</a>	The <a href="#">Conference on the Future of Europe</a> was convened to give citizens a say on what matters to them, and to suggest areas where the European Union has the competence to act or where European Union action would be to the benefit of European citizens. Its agenda specifically aligns with the Strategic Agenda of the European Council and the 2019-2024 Political Guidelines of the European Commission. It addressed <a href="#">responses to Covid-19</a> and at least one recommendation directly addressed <a href="#">control of pandemic countering measures</a> .	Europe	May 2021	International organisation	The European Parliament, European Council, and European Commission assisted by assisted by a Deliberation Team comprised of Missions Publiques (France), Deliberativa (Spain), Ifok (Germany), and DBT (Denmark)	European Union	800 European citizens were randomly selected (200 for each of 4 European Citizens' Panels) by the market research company Kantar Public to reflect diversity in the EU in terms of geographic region, gender, age, economic background, and educational attainment. 1/3 of each Panel was under 25. The Conference Plenary's attendees were gender-balanced and included 80 delegates from the European Citizens' Panels, as well as 108 individuals from the European Parliament, 108 from all national EU Parliaments, 54 from the Council, and representatives of other stakeholder groups as appropriate. There also were national citizens' panels and a multilingual digital platform.

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
Medical-Religious community engagement conference call series <sup>4</sup>	To reach out to the community and assess the feasibility and process implementation of a conference call series.	Maryland, USA	March-April 2020	Academic Institution	Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center	Johns Hopkins Medical Center	Each call had approximately 125 participants on average, ranging from 78 to 202 participants. The total weekly participation averaged around 250 people per call. Additionally, 40 community members attended at least three of the five calls. "Originally, the calls were promoted to community members who participated in training programs offered by the Healthy Community Partnership and the Department of Spiritual Care and Chaplaincy...the number of callers escalated as word spread throughout the community. Representatives from religious communities, senior centers, hospitals and other health care centers, community service organizations, and the local government joined the calls". 4
Red Cross and Red Crescent approach to using community feedback to guide Covid-19 response in sub-Saharan Africa <sup>5</sup>	To gain feedback on and inform operational decisions and shape and adapt the Red Cross and Red Crescent response to Covid-19.	sub-Saharan Africa	January-October 2020	International organization	Red Cross and Red Crescent	Red Cross and Red Crescent	110,000 individual community feedback comments. No demographic information available for people who submitted comments.

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
Collaboration Between Faith-Based Communities and Public Health <sup>6</sup>	To describe the negotiations between public health and religious communities by documenting the initiation of the negotiation, the actors, the processes and outcomes of the meetings (obstacles and facilitators) and the follow-up processes	Montreal, Canada	April 2020	Local government	Montreal Regional Public Health Unit	No funding received	33 community representatives from the Public Health Unit, Transcultural psychiatry team, police, Jewish community and Muslim community.
First Nations Community Panels <sup>7</sup>	To understand from First Nations participants if First Nations Community Panels are an acceptable and appropriate way of engaging First Nations Peoples in making decisions around infectious disease emergencies.	New South Wales and Queensland, Australia	September 2019-December 2020	Academic institution	Menzies School of Health Research, Charles Darwin University, Casuarina, Northern Territory, Australia  Population Health, Hunter New England Local Health District, Wallsend, New South Wales, Australia	Australian Partnership for Preparedness Research on Infectious Disease Emergencies is a Centre of Research Excellence funded by the Australian Government National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC)	40 representative people selected by First Nations stakeholders
<b>INVOLVEMENT</b>							
<a href="#">Bristol Citizens' Assembly</a>	To gather public input to inform the city of Bristol's Covid-19 recovery plan.	Bristol, UK	January-March 2021	Local government	<a href="#">Involve</a> (a non-profit non-governmental organization)	Bristol government	60 randomly selected participants that reflected the diversity of the population in terms of age, sex, ethnicity, disability, employment status, and geographical location. The participants were compensated for their participation.

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<a href="#">Citizens' committee on vaccination against Covid-19</a>	To issue opinions and observations on vaccine policies and formulate proposals relating to the questions, fears, resistance, and ethical questions raised by vaccination against COVID-19.	France	January-March 2021	National government	<a href="#">Missions Publiques</a> (a for-profit business hired by the Economic, Social and Environmental Council (the Conseil Économique, Social et Environnemental – CESE), which is an independent government agency.	French government	35 citizens selected at random for a citizens' committee and a participation platform open to the general public. The randomly selected citizens were asked about their intentions to be vaccinated to ensure a diversity of points of view.
<a href="#">Camden Health and Care Citizens' Assembly</a>	To shape the common purpose of Camden's new Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy. The Assembly was charged with developing three principles for the local health partnership to consider when implementing future change to the health and care system. The initial purpose was for residents to deliberate solely on health and care. However, the Assembly's focus shifted slightly after the first session to explicitly include Covid-19's effects on the participants.	Camden, UK	February-September 2020	Local government	Camden Council (local government) worked with a range of partners to prepare for and deliver the assembly. An Advisory Group was established consisting of experts from across Camden's health and care system and more widely, including academia and experts in deliberative engagement ( <a href="#">Kaleidoscope Health and Care</a> and <a href="#">Involve</a> ).	Camden's Health and Wellbeing Board (local government)	Over 150 Camden residents were initially recruited, and 60 were invited to attend the Assembly. The 60 selected were stratified based on census data to reflect Camden's population; an internal data team completed this process. The variables used for the stratification process were Camden wards, age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, housing status, disability, and caring responsibilities. A group of local people trained to do engagement and consultation for the Council recruited participants through door-to-door and on-street recruitment. Recruitment also took place in various voluntary community organisations and health and care community settings. Recruitment was not advertised to all Camden residents.

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
Community conference call series (Galiatsatos 2020)	To reach out to the community and assess the feasibility and process implementation of a conference call series for leaders and members of religious communities	Maryland, USA	March-April 2020	Academic Institution	Johns Hopkins Bayview Medical Center	Johns Hopkins	Each call had around 125 participants on average, ranging from 78 to 202 participants. The total weekly participation averaged around 250 people per call. Additionally, 40 community members attended at least three of the five calls.
Red Cross and Red Crescent approach to using community feedback to guide Covid-19 response in sub-Saharan Africa (Erlach 2021)	To gain feedback on and inform operational decisions and shape and adapt the Red Cross and Red Crescent response to Covid-19.	sub-Saharan Africa	January-October 2020	International organization	Red Cross and Red Crescent	Red Cross and Red Crescent	110,000 individual community feedback comments. No demographic information available for people who submitted comments.
Collaboration Between Faith-Based Communities and Public Health (El-Majzoub 2021)	To describe the negotiations between public health and religious communities by documenting the initiation of the negotiation, the actors, the processes and outcomes of the meetings (obstacles and facilitators) and the follow-up processes	Montreal, Canada	April 2020	Local government	Montreal Regional Public Health Unit	No funding received	33 community representatives from the Public Health Unit, Transcultural psychiatry team, police, Jewish community and Muslim community.

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
First Nations Community Panels (Crooks 2022)	To understand from First Nations participants if First Nations Community Panels are an acceptable and appropriate way of engaging First Nations Peoples in making decisions around infectious disease emergencies.	New South Wales and Queensland, Australia	September 2019-December 2020	Academic institution	Menzies School of Health Research, Charles Darwin University, Casuarina, Northern Territory, Australia  Population Health, Hunter New England Local Health District, Wallsend, New South Wales, Australia	Australian Partnership for Preparedness Research on Infectious Disease Emergencies is a Centre of Research Excellence funded by the Australian Government National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC)	40 representative people selected by First Nations stakeholders
<b>COLLABORATION</b>							
<a href="#">Extraordinary online session of the Citizens' Convention on Climate: Finding a way out of the Covid-19 crisis</a>	The Citizens' Convention on Climate was mandated by the French President in 2019 to identify measures to achieve an objective of reduction of at least 40% in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. It held an extraordinary online session to discuss the economic and social consequences of the Covid-19 crisis within the framework of their mandate, linking the Convention's agenda to recommendations on how the government should start thinking about reopening the economy.	France	April 2020	National government	The Economic, Social and Environmental Council (the Conseil Économique, Social et Environnemental – CESE), which is an independent government agency.	French government	150 citizens were randomly selected by <a href="#">Harris Interactive</a> to achieve a panel representative of the French population (gender, age, level of education, socio-professional categories, residency, and geographical areas).

Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
<a href="#">COVID-19 Culturally &amp; Linguistically Diverse Community Forums: South Australia</a>	As the second wave of covid-19 started to affect Melbourne in late June / early July 2020, the South Australian (SA) Government became anxious about constraints on their ability to work with specific communities to ensure a potential outbreak did not occur in SA. Specifically, they were aware that they did not deeply understand the cultural challenges in multicultural communities, nor did they have a way of working with them to contain an outbreak quickly and effectively. Thus, <a href="#">SA Health</a> engaged <a href="#">democracyCo</a> to conduct a forum of 250 multicultural leaders from over 70 communities to better understand their fears, concerns and needs around covid-19.	South Australia, Australia	July 2020		<a href="#">democracyCo</a> (a for-profit business)	South Australia (regional) government	Over 100 culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) community leader attended. The Multicultural Communities Council of SA assisted <a href="#">democracyCo</a> in accessing all CALD community leaders. Invitations were issued to more than 250 people. The number of forums conducted was in direct response to the RSVP's received, ensuring that no more than 50 people attended each forum.



Initiative	Purpose	Location	Dates	Institutional base	Organiser	Funder	Participants
Crowdsourcing communication for prevention strategies <sup>8</sup>	To trial a participatory approach to Indigenous language prevention messaging, that is suitable for rapid content generation, by seeking unscripted videos directly from individuals in remote communities via a crowdsourcing campaign	Northern Territory of Australia	2020	Non-profit organization	One Disease (not-for-profit health organization and Skinnyfish—a local music production company)	One Disease	19 submissions (18 accepted) from individual or groups of Aboriginal people.
Crowdsourcing Approaches to University Community Engagement and strategic planning during Covid-19 <sup>9</sup>	To identify creative ideas for a safe fall semester through a community-engaged process	North Carolina	Summer 2020	Academic institution	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC)	Carolina Fund, administered by the Development Office of the University of North Carolina	82 unique submissions from individuals and teams of students, staff, faculty and others

Table 2. Methods, interactions, training and support, decision making, communication of results

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
<b>CONSULTATION</b>					
<a href="#">Connecting to Congress Online Town Halls on the Covid-19 emergency</a> <sup>1</sup>	Public meetings	Participants received background information before the town hall, and they were invited to fill both a pre- and post-survey to capture their opinions and concerns. They could add specific questions to the surveys. The deliberative online town halls ran 60 to 90 minutes. The moderator opened the session by explaining the rules of the town	Prior to participation, constituents received a high-quality, fact-based issue guide. This allowed participants to enter the event with ample background information so that they were prepared to ask more in-depth questions of their representative, and it ensured that all participants had the opportunity to arrive at the	The online platforms on which the town halls were hosted allowed for live polling of constituents while they were participating in the event, and the results were displayed in real time for the member(s), experts, and participants to see.	The organisers prepared reports to each participating member of Congress tailored to their constituents' responses.

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
		<p>hall and emphasizes the non-partisan nature of the event. The member of Congress then made opening remarks before citizens sent their Covid-19 related questions through online platforms. The questions were taken on a first-come, first-served basis while giving priority to each participant's first question, combining the ones that were similar, and rejecting those that were off-topic. The moderator then relayed the questions to the member of Congress, whose response was live streamed to constituents. For bipartisan town halls, both members of Congress had an opportunity to respond to the questions. Following the event, a final report was sent to the congressional office of the relevant member of Congress.</p>	<p>event with a similar foundation of knowledge. We intentionally conceived of "subject matter experts" as more than public health officials, and when public health officials participated, they hailed from county- and state-level posts. In allowing public health officials and those with other domains of expertise to converse and answers questions alongside members of Congress, we expanded both the range of voices from whom constituents were able to hear and the expert opinion to which the participating members of Congress were exposed.</p>		
<a href="#">Deliberative Consultation on Trade-offs Related to Using 'CovidSafe' Contact Tracing Technology</a> <sup>2</sup>	Public meetings	Small groups of citizens heard from experts before engaging in a facilitated discussion.	<p>Participants were also sent a booklet containing fact-based information and a range of perspectives on the COVIDSafe app as a primer for discussions. Each workshop commenced with a short orientation session. The groups were presented with further evidence in three pre-recorded presentations focused on</p>	A poll was taken in which participants were asked to respond to the questions about the appropriateness of legislation supporting the COVIDSafe app. Participants' underpinning reasoning and dissenting views, were recorded in a final facilitated feedback session.	The results were reported in an academic publication. <sup>2</sup>

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
			understanding; SARS-COV-2 infections and the importance of contact tracing to public health responses to Covid-19; the COVIDSafe app and supporting legislation; and the socio-technical implications of deploying a contact tracing technology for health, and, potentially, society-wide surveillance. After each presentation the experts were available through videoconferencing for participants to ask questions and clarify the evidence and opinions presented.		
<a href="#">Scottish Crowdsourcing Exercise "Coronavirus (COVID-19): framework for decision making"<sup>3</sup></a>	Informal online processes	The exercise was hosted on Dialogue, a digital platform for discursive conversations. The platform allowed registered users to submit ideas. Participants were encouraged to provide a title for their idea and to explain 'why the contribution is important'. Users could rate any of the ideas on a five-star scale, and/or provide comments. All contributions to the website were pre-moderated in accordance with the platform's moderation policy before appearing on the site.	None. The Scottish Government asked people about how lockdown affected them, and what their priorities would be if the lockdown was eased – for example, the reopening of businesses, when kids should be allowed back to school, and visiting relatives.	3,274 of the 11,692 registered users submitted a total of 4,122 ideas and 17,966 comments. 132 ideas were rejected due to being in breach of the moderation policy. In addition to using the platform, members of the public submitted 136 emails that were also included in the analysis. The public was not involved in analysing the input, preparing the report, or decision-making.	All ideas were analysed and categorised and fed back internally to ministers as well as to policy teams. A daily briefing of findings was circulated to different people and departments within the Scottish government. <sup>3</sup> The briefings led to requests for different specific topic briefs from departments, for example, "There are people posting about recycling centres a lot, can you summarise that?" or, "What's being said about schools?" Some initial analyses were reported to the public. A full report was prepared two weeks after the Dialogue challenge was closed. <sup>10</sup>
<a href="#">Climate Assembly UK and the Covid-19 crisis</a>	Public meetings	The discussion on Covid-19 took place during the last meeting of Climate Assembly UK and was held online. A	The second meeting of the Assembly included a presentation on "considering evidence". <sup>11</sup> Due to time	Following the discussion, participants voted on the two additional questions related to	The Climate Assembly UK released an interim report containing the results of the two votes (see below) and verbatim quotes from assembly members about the rationale

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
		presentation was followed by facilitated, small-group discussions using Zoom breakout rooms.	constraints and uncertainties related to Covid-19, the participants did not hear detailed evidence for this discussion as they did in previous discussions. Instead, they listened to a presentation by one of the 'Expert Leads', who is also Chief Executive of the Committee on Climate Change. <sup>12 13</sup>	economic recovery and lifestyle changes.	behind their recommendations. <sup>12</sup> The interim report was released ahead of the full report in order to inform the Parliament's and Government's responses to the COVID-19 crisis. The full report was published several months later. <sup>14</sup>
<a href="#">#LockDownDebate: Rapid online deliberation on contact tracing</a>	Public meetings	Zoom was used for deliberations. Participants were divided into 8 small groups of 8 people to engage in a facilitated discussion. Asynchronous activities on the online platform, <a href="#">Engagement HQ</a> were integrated into the process for the participants to complete a range of different activities each week. The activities included individual journaling to foster reflection among participants throughout the process, idea generation activities, and short surveys.	The learning phase of this project relied on five expert presentations that were made online. All materials, including the presentations, were posted on the online platform for participants to revisit in their own time.	Due to the small amount of evidence on the subject matter available in the public domain during the process, this project did not seek to create recommendations. The participants were invited to share their divergent perspectives to help understand the values and beliefs behind one's position. The goal of the process was to cluster, prioritize, and synthesize the questions and ideas that emerged over the course of the three weeks.	While the "LockDown Debate" contributes, on the one hand, to the methodological discussion on how to best run online deliberative processes during times of crisis, it also produced findings on navigating trade-offs related to using technologies in mitigating the propagation of COVID-19. <sup>15</sup> The Ada Lovelace Institute published the report "Confidence in crisis?" that explores these findings. <sup>16</sup>
<a href="#">Citizens' Panel – Planning the West Midlands' Recovery</a>	Public meetings	The citizens' panel was conducted online using Microsoft Teams. The process included both plenary sessions and breakout groups.	The participants had access to an "expert vox-pop library" to support their deliberation. This library was made of short videos pre-recorded by experts to provide information about specific policy areas. The panellists had access to the videos during the whole process. Fact sheets were	Priorities that emerged were re-grouped under broader categories. Panellists were then asked to summarize in one sentence the aim of the recovery in those areas. Scales were used to stimulate deliberation on principles to guide the recovery. The emerging principles were then synthesized, reviewed, and	The citizens' panel and its deliberative process identified a series of priorities and principles to guide and inform the work of the WMRCG. In addition, BritainThinks conducted a survey of 500 members of the public in the West Midlands using the insights from the citizens' panel. <sup>17</sup> The report was presented to the West Midlands' Metro-Mayor and the leaders of the regions' seven Local Authorities at the Mayors and Leaders Policy Forum. <sup>18</sup>

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
			shared with participants ahead of the second week's sessions	edited by a representative group of six panellists elected by the whole panel.	
<a href="#">Oregon Citizens' Assembly on Covid-19 Recovery</a>	Public meetings	Structured deliberative process with presentations, small group discussions, and report-back.	Presentations by subject-matter experts.	Voting – final recommendations supported by at least 2/3 of participants.	A final report <sup>19</sup> was presented at a virtual press conference, provided to interested legislators, and distributed by the networks of Healthy Democracy and Oregon's Kitchen Table.
<a href="#">Dialogue and Deliberative Workshops on Covid-19 and the NHS (National Health Service)</a> <sup>20</sup>	Public meetings	Online workshops that combined moderated discussions in small break-out groups of around 6 people and plenary sessions where information was shared by experts or by moderators who shared summaries of findings from the smaller groups. Scenarios, expert presentations, handouts, and exercises with fictional cases were used in both stages. The deliberation workshops focused on more specific topics than the dialogue stage.	Expert presentations and written briefing materials	During the final workshop, the research team's reflection of what participants told them was presented back to participants. Each of the ten groups were encouraged to discuss the expectations in turn. Participants were asked whether they thought (1) they reflected the discussions held in their respective groups, (2) they should be reformulated or reworded, and (3) whether there was anything missing. Each expectation (in relation to the ideas and proposals discussed during the workshops) was then refined and presented back to the participants at the end of the fourth and final workshop.	A final report was prepared by Ipsos MORI. The intended output was an informed and considered set of expectations to guide future planning and engagement by the NHS in London.
<a href="#">Online Public Dialogues on Covid-19 Winter Preparedness</a> <sup>21 22</sup>	Public meetings	The twelve participants were asked to react extracts from interviews conducted previously, expert panels, and scenarios. The discussions were facilitated by a team of researchers with extensive training and experience working with the public and	Expert presentations, video presentations, written briefing materials	At the end of the workshops, participants discussed common reactions to stress and anxiety, and identified positive actions to mitigate these feelings during a session moderated by a mental health expert.	The goal of the workshops was to identify what the government should prioritize and communicate to the public to mitigate the extent of a new surge of cases of coronavirus infections. A summary of these results was published in the report from The Academy of Medical Sciences as part of their work on the preparedness for a new wave of COVID-19 infections over winter 2020-21.

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
		vulnerable populations. The workshops also entailed a “wind-down” section moderated by mental health expert.			
<a href="#">Nantes Métropole Citizens' Convention</a>	Public meetings	Citizens met for 4 weekend work sessions interspersed with additional sequences of evening discussions from November 2020 to February 2021. Due to the confinement, all the sessions initially planned in person were carried out online. <sup>23 24</sup> Participants decided on the themes to be explored. <sup>25</sup> To inform their discussions, they interviewed experts, <sup>26 27</sup> and asked the public two questions. <sup>28 29</sup>	Experts were invited to provide information on the topics that were identified by the participants.	A first version of the report was written by the Missions Publiques, the organiser, based on the participants' discussions. <sup>27 30 31</sup> A reading committee of about 10 participants proofread the report. At the last session all the participants reviewed the report. Six participants were randomly selected to present the report to elected officials. <sup>32</sup>	An “advisory mirror group” made up of volunteer members ensured that elected officials were kept informed in real-time about the concerns and observations that were raised. <sup>33</sup> A Gazette was prepared by Missions Publiques, <sup>31</sup> the organiser, after each session, a 176-page opinion was presented to elected officials in March, <sup>34</sup> Nantes Métropole submitted a response in June including around a hundred actions and reported on those commitments after one year. <sup>35-40</sup>
<a href="#">Scottish Parliament Citizens' Panel on Covid-19</a> <sup>41</sup>	Consensus processes	The Citizens' Panel met virtually over four Saturdays in January and February 2021.	There was a series of presentations by experts, including a presentation about assessing evidence and applying critical thinking during the process. The participants then worked in small groups to produce a prioritised set of ‘top tips’ that could be used to weigh-up evidence. The participants then came to an agreement on a list of ‘deliberation tips’ that were referred to throughout its sittings to support their work.	The final decision-making stage was based on a consensus model. The whole group suggested and reviewed potential recommendations and agreed as a group. Each participant was asked to have a green object and a red object in front of them to aid the decision-making process. If the panel member agreed with the proposal, they would show the green object. If they had further questions or changes they wanted to make, they would hold up the red object to prompt further discussion in order to come to a consensus.	The COVID-19 Committee of the Scottish Parliament received the report and took evidence from five participants during a session on February 18th, 2021.

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
<a href="#">Citizens' Assembly on restrictions and recommendations in response to the COVID-19 pandemic</a> <sup>42, 43</sup>	Public meetings	The discussions took place on the weekend of the 13th and 14th March using the Zoom. The discussion started with a presentation of the principles of the discussion. The participants formulated questions for experts in small groups of about seven people. After listening to the experts' answers, they divided into the same small groups and weighed the corona restrictions and their acceptability. At the end of the discussion the first day, the participants answered a short survey. The program was similar on the second day, but with different experts.	Pre-videotaped expert presentations, followed by the formulation of questions in small groups, and the experts answering the questions for the whole group. The formulation of the questions and the discussion in small groups were guided by moderators trained for the task.	The participants' opinions about the fight against the coronavirus, the restrictions and recommendations related to the fight were measured before the deliberation in the recruitment survey, after the first day of the deliberation, and at the end of the deliberation. Attitudes towards restrictions and recommendations were measured by asking how acceptable the respondents considered a specific recommendation or restriction on a scale of 0–10.	The Citizens' Assembly was organized for research purposes. A report concerning the planning and execution of the mini-public was written by the researchers and sent to experts and participants. The report included some preliminary results.
<a href="#">Conference on the Future of Europe</a> <sup>44</sup>	Public meetings	The Conference had a 4-part structure: a Multilingual Digital Platform for idea sharing; decentralized events hosted by various European individuals and organizations; European Citizens' Panels; and a Conference Plenary. The Multilingual Digital Platform served as a centralized point of information for the Conference's different arms, a collection of its documents and records, and a means of encouraging debate and discussion on Conference events. Decentralized conference events were	There was <a href="#">online information about the platform</a> and <a href="#">how to organise events</a> . There was a guide for the <a href="#">citizens' panels</a> and experts for each panel. Nine <a href="#">thematic Working Groups</a> gave input to prepare the debates and the proposals of the Conference Plenary by discussing the recommendations from the respective European and National Citizens' Panels as well as the contributions on the Multilingual Digital Platform related to the Working Group's topics.	After the recommendations were presented by and discussed with citizens, the Plenary had to put forward its proposals on a consensual basis to the Executive Board. Consensus had to be found at least between the representatives of the European Parliament, the Council, the European Commission and representatives from national Parliaments, on an equal footing. If there was a clear diverging position from representatives of citizens from national events or	The <a href="#">report on the final outcome</a> of the Conference, including 49 proposals, was presented to the Presidents of the European Parliament, Council, and Commission on 9 May 2022. <sup>44</sup>

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
		<p>organized at different levels—nationally, transnationally, regionally, and locally—and involved different stakeholders and groups. The Conference's 4 European Citizens' Panels met—both in person and online—to form recommendations on specific themes: 1) Stronger economy, social justice, jobs, education, culture, sport, digital transformation; 2) EU democracy, values, rights, rule of law, security; 3) Climate change, environment, health; and 4) EU in the world, migration. The Conference Plenary's purpose was to consider recommendations forwarded by national and European Citizens' Panels, as well as by the Multilingual Digital Platform, before relaying its subsequent recommendations to the Executive Board. The Conference Plenary convened at the European Parliament in Strasbourg, France.</p>		<p>European or National Citizens' Panels, this had to be expressed in this report.</p>	
<p>Medical-Religious community engagement conference call series<sup>4</sup></p>	<p>Public meetings</p>	<p>Calls were held twice a week for 6 weeks. Each call included an introduction, COVID-19 updates, information on specific COVID-19 health issues, questions from callers, and a closing meditation. Once a week, community members</p>	<p>Medical experts shared their expertise and insight into the pandemic (e.g., infectious disease, geriatrics, physical therapy, chaplaincy, psychology, pediatrics, ethics, health equity). Various topics were discussed, including</p>	<p>The intention was to assure accordance with public health instructions using equitable strategies for at-risk and vulnerable populations and communities. Community leaders were able to discuss struggles and successes on</p>	<p>Information from the community calls were being shared by phone calls, texts and emails, as well as with caregiver support groups, book clubs, community associations, etc.</p>



Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
		shared their thoughts on their community needs and successes. All calls were recorded and accessible to community members at any time.	advance care planning, telemedicine, social isolation, mental health, meditation and other coping strategies, and inequalities among vulnerable populations. Government and community organization representatives shared information about the resources and services they provide to community members (e.g., food access, counseling, assistance with civil legal issues, and aging services)	behalf of their congregations, schools, or constituents. Through the calls, strategies to address challenges were addressed and potentially harmful misinformation was identified and corrected. Information from the meetings also could lead to refine public health messaging and policies to mitigate the spread of Covid-19.	
Red Cross and Red Crescent approach to using community feedback to guide Covid-19 response in sub-Saharan Africa <sup>5</sup>	Public meetings	Used a system developed during the Ebola outbreak to collect, analyze, and act on community feedback relating to the response during health promotion activities. For those contexts where direct, in-person contact was not possible due to lockdowns imposed by governments, WhatsApp groups with community members or community volunteers were established to receive feedback and address rumors, questions, suggestions, or concerns. National societies also scaled up their use of social media, such as Facebook, to engage with community members about COVID-19.	The tools included a simple form for recording comments shared during risk communication and community engagement activities such as household visits, focus group discussions, or health promotion campaigns in public places; a guide for conducting focus group discussions; and a simple Microsoft Excel log sheet for entering and managing community feedback.	The intention was to make this information available to all responders to encourage its use for operational decision making.	On a regular basis (initially every week and then every 2 weeks), the IFRC Africa regional office produced simple reports on trends in community feedback, with recommendations on how to address the main concerns.

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
Collaboration Between Faith-Based Communities and Public Health <sup>6</sup>	Public meetings	Six public meetings where the first meeting was initiated by the Public Health Unit. The following meetings were initiated by the community. The Public Health Unit approached the Transcultural psychiatry team, asking them to mediate a meeting where they wanted to discuss in a culturally sensitive way the decision to close the mikvah. The interventions were documented via field notes and diaries by observers of the meetings.	None.	The meetings did not lead to the immediate reopening of the mikvah, as the government of Quebec opted to maintain a complete ban on all religious activities. The Public Health Unit stayed in regular contact with the community to answer questions regarding governmental measures, and the mikvah reopened in June as part of the deconfinement plan. The police made themselves less visible in their interventions, and the community was encouraged to file reports of phone harassment and hate incidents. The community respected public health measures during Passover. One mosque submitted a formal request for small group (5–10 individuals) gatherings at the mosque by appointment for worship with physical distancing. This was responded to with a grid explaining how the risks of such activity would outweigh the benefits	The experiences from this study led to the writing of a mediation guide in collaboration with the public health unit.
First Nations Community Panels <sup>7</sup>	Public meetings	Parallel digital and in-person Step 1: Community engagement Engagement with the local Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Organisation in each area and with	Participant Information Statement and provided informed written consent prior to the Panels.  Eleven experts recruited according to professional roles	None. The research aimed to understand if First Nations community panels are an acceptable and appropriate way of engaging First Nations Peoples in making decisions	A final recommendations report was submitted to health policy decision-makers for consideration summarizing panellists' perspectives and decisions on each key issue.

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
		<p>community representatives to discuss the topic and gauge knowledge and understanding. Engagement with community members took place before, during and after the study.</p> <p>Step 2: Pre-panel yarning session</p> <p>Panel members were invited to attend a yarning circle scheduled the night before the first panel session. Pre-panel yarning provided an opportunity for participants to meet one another and the research team, and informally discuss the topic and share their experiences. Panel composition ranged from 7 to 11 participants per Panel.</p> <p>Step 3: Evidence and deliberation days – orientation outlining the process, information about the research, presentation of evidence from experts, question and answer session, small group discussions. Discussion of community feedback, consensus and draft recommendations, community feedback, follow-up yarning session.</p>	<p>and knowledge of the field relevant to the topic provided evidence-based information to Panels as pre-recorded presentations.</p>	<p>around infectious disease emergencies.</p>	
<b>INVOLVEMENT</b>					

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
<a href="#">Bristol Citizens' Assembly</a> <sup>45</sup>	Public meetings	Six focus group discussions and a survey were used to identify the themes and issues addressed during the deliberative phase of the project. The citizens' assembly met for four weekends. Each weekend entailed three sessions of 2.5 hours each. During the first weekend, the participants learned about the deliberative process and began discussing the principles that should underpin their work. For the second and third weekend, the assembly was divided into three groups of 20 people, each considering one of the three topics. They heard evidence from the speakers and worked on elaborating their recommendations.	Assembly members were provided with support to fully participate in the online assembly process. Each participant underwent an onboarding process by which they had individual assessment of their needs and any access requirements, including childcare, interpretation, or other support such as suitable computer or internet connection to be able to take part online. Before the first assembly meeting, everyone had a chance for a warmup call to get used to using Zoom, and there was an online hub (using a platform called Basecamp) available to assembly members where they could access resources relating to the assembly and have informal discussions with each other. There were dedicated assembly member support staff available between and during assembly weekends, throughout the assembly process. An independent advisory group provided advice and oversight to ensure the evidence and materials were comprehensive, accurate and balanced, and independence of the materials produced as	During the last weekend, the whole assembly discussed the three topics. After hearing from their colleagues, the participants went back to their subgroup to finalize their recommendations. Although the process was largely consensual, the participants voted on the recommendations to demonstrate their level of support or opposition to each of them.	A steering group was responsible for key decisions surrounding the assembly such as subject matters for discussion, membership and role of the Advisory Group, and communications around the role of the assembly to the Cabinet, the public and stakeholders. The steering group was chaired by two city councillors. Involve ran the citizens' assembly – facilitating and designing the process by which the assembly members learned, considered and came to recommendations, and wrote the final report. <sup>45</sup>

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
			background for assembly members.		
<a href="#">Citizens' committee on vaccination against Covid-19</a> <sup>46 47</sup>	Public meetings	<p>An online consultation platform for the public was set up to support the work of the citizens' committee. There were over 100,000 submissions to the platform expressing opinions of French people on issues such as their motivations and hesitations regarding vaccination and opinions regarding a vaccine passport. The sessions of the citizens' committee took place online. Participants interacted with experts and used a deliberative process that included small group discussions as well as plenary sessions.</p> <p>A temporary commission was established by the Economic, Social and Environmental Council (CESE) in response to the referral from the Prime Minister. Four members of the citizens committee were randomly selected each month to participate in weekly meetings of the temporary commission. The president of the temporary commission and three co-rapporteurs followed the sessions of the citizens committee as observers, as did five volunteer advisers who</p>	<p>During the first session, there were presentations by the Director of the Government Information Service (SIG), the Director of a regional hospital trust, pharmaceutical syndicates, two doctors (a general practitioner and a specialist), a hospital director, and the mayor of Lyon. Topics covered included medical, communication, legal, and logistical issues. <a href="#">Eurogroup Consulting</a> and <a href="#">Missions Publiques</a> ran the citizens' committee and coordinated the schedule of its work with that of the temporary commission.</p>	<p>Draft recommendations of the citizens' committee were finalised at a plenary session. The recommendations were proofread by five volunteers. The temporary commission had 35 members from the 18 groups sitting on CESE. The recommendations made by the citizens' committee were voted on by the temporary commission and the votes for each recommendation were reported. Four subgroups of the commission addressed arguments for and against controversies and shared these with the entire group.</p>	<p>Seven recommendations were reported to the government by the temporary committee at the end of its mandate and a progress report concluded its work.</p>

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
		were members of the temporary commission.			
<a href="#">Camden Health and Care Citizens' Assembly</a> <sup>48</sup>	Public meetings	The first session was face-to-face. After hearing from local experts, the participants were encouraged to deliberate and discuss their thoughts about the most important health and care issues that needed addressing in Camden. They deliberated on what they believed a successful assembly would lead to and discussed their individual top priorities for health and care and then collectively deliberated to come up with some top priorities. The second session was conducted online after a three-month delay due to Covid-19. The focus shifted to include the effects of the pandemic and lockdown on the participants. They deliberated in small groups on the adjusted priorities, allowing participants the opportunity to give their opinions on the priorities, including their expectations for achieving the priorities. Prior to the next session, participants were encouraged to ask other people in Camden about their experiences. In session three experts from local organisations gave their view	Before each event, the organisers distributed information packs to provide background details and instructions on how to join in on the event. There were presentations by experts followed by question-and-answer sessions. Discussions were assisted by trained facilitators to help with members' participation.	Many expectations were produced, typically stating what the participants believed was necessary for health and care services to deliver good outcomes. It was decided to treat all expectations as equally important as no consensus emerged. It is not clear what, if any, voting mechanism was used. At the end, the participants individually, and then in small groups, deliberated on how local services, community groups and charities, and individuals could help achieve the expectations.	A final report was prepared by Kaleidoscope Health and Care. Recommendations noted in the report included information being disseminated so the success of the process could be measured and hosting regular citizens' assemblies to assess the impact of the Assembly. Camden's Health and Wellbeing Board received the final set of expectations and was tasked with ensuring that they informed the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy. The assembly received very little media coverage.

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
		on health inequalities (the top priority), participants deliberated on this and shared their own experiences and those of others in breakout groups. Session four focused on the second priority using the same approach as the third session. They explored the third priority in the final session.			
<b>COLLABORATION</b>					
<a href="#">Extraordinary online session of the Citizens' Convention on Climate: Finding a way out of the Covid-19 crisis</a> <sup>49-52</sup>	Public meetings	During two days of work the participants had online discussions about the ins and outs of a plan to find a way out of the crisis and climate and social issues related to it. In general, most of the interactions of the Citizens' Convention were in sub-groups, which would share their work with all the 150 members of the Convention.	Specialists in citizen dialogue from <a href="#">Eurogroup Consulting</a> and <a href="#">Missions Publiques</a> facilitated the work of the Convention. No specific skill was required of participants. A Governance Committee called on several research centres to form a team of resource people from different disciplines to answer questions of the Convention and assist with fact checking. A legislative committee was responsible for the legislative and regulatory transcription of the Convention's proposals.	The Governance Committee, which included members of the Convention, was responsible for supporting the Convention, preserving its independence, and respecting its will. Three guarantors were appointed to ensure compliance with the rules of independence, ethics, and process. The report underlined what members of the Convention agreed on, what formed a consensus within it. It also highlighted elements on which there was not agreement, the points of dissension.	A press release was published on the on the website of the Citizens' Convention on Climate). The convention shared 50 of 150 draft proposals with the executive without delay. They chose not to share the proposals with the public before the final session, when they finalised and voted on all their proposals
<a href="#">COVID-19 Culturally &amp; Linguistically Diverse Community Forums: South Australia</a> <sup>53 54</sup>	Public meetings	Two 3-hour Zoom meetings were conducted with 30-40 people per workshop. Participants spent time in small breakout rooms (of approximately 7 people per room) to explore and discuss a series of issues such as fears and concerns.	Participants were provided with a package that explained the process. The workshops included a briefing session conducted by the Chief Public Health Officer to set the scene.	The workshops ended with participants completing a survey (while still online). Upon completion of the survey participants were invited into a 'departure lounge' to speak directly with the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the Assistant Minister to the	Less than one week after the workshops, a 100-page report was provided to SA Health which detailed the levels of concern across more than 50 communities, information about where and how those communities meet, social media and communications details.

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
				Premier, and the Chief Public Health Officer. Following the workshop, the survey was provided to participants to send to their networks. An additional 60 people completed the survey. Participants were followed up with directly by <a href="#">democracyCo</a> if further information was required and to double check the content of the report.	
Crowdsourcing communication for prevention strategies <sup>8</sup>	Informal online processes	The brief given to potential contributors was to generate a video presenting a clear and simple message in a local Aboriginal language to regularly wash hands for at least 20 s (first campaign), or to maintain 1.5 m physical distancing (second campaign). No scripting was provided. To maintain authenticity and respect for the contributors, no post-production editing was conducted, so contributors knew that their work would not be modified. Videos were required to be at least 30 s long, and could be submitted for consideration via WhatsApp message to the director of Skinnyfish. The acceptability criteria for videos were a clear message about one or both of the two COVID-19 hygiene topics, and	An invitation to script, design and produce a Covid-19 prevention video on handwashing or maintaining physical distance in a local Aboriginal language was distributed. No support or training was given in the production or editing of the videos.	None.	Videos meeting the criteria outlined in the invitation were distributed via Facebook paid advertising.



Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
		<p>an acceptable video length (i.e., minimum 30 s). Imperfect videography was expected and accepted. All videos were filmed on mobile phones. Videos were assessed by a panel of One Disease staff, all public health nurses, to ensure that demonstrations and/or examples presented were accurate from a public health perspective. If deemed inaccurate, contributors were provided feedback and given the opportunity to submit a revised video. Upon confirmation of acceptance, contributors were paid the equivalent of one full day's work.</p>			
Crowdsourcing Approaches to University Community Engagement and strategic planning during Covid-19 <sup>9</sup>	Informal online processes	<p>All promotion of the open call was conducted online using email, social media platforms, and livestream events. Submissions to the open call were collected via a submission form hosted on the online survey platform Qualtrics. Participants of the open call could submit ideas in response to 1 or more of 4 submission categories. Following the judging period, the researchers issued an online survey to all finalists and runners-up with brief questions regarding future implementation of their ideas.</p>	<p>The steering committee set the open call parameters, determining that the focus should be on obtaining creative ideas to inform safety in the fall semester. Four prompts were developed to serve as the categories for submitting ideas to the open call.</p> <p>As an incentive to encourage contributions, a total of \$20 000 in prize money was obtained from the UNC Development Office via the Carolina Fund. The organizing committee convened 2 information sessions hosted</p>	Indirectly used to inform potential future interventions.	All of the finalists and runner-up teams were to be showcased on the Carolina Collective website and received support from Innovate Carolina to either provide relevant resources for further development of their ideas or meetings to discuss next steps in implementing their ideas.

Initiative	Category	Interactions	Training & support	Decision making	Communication of results
			using videoconferencing to provide potential participants with more details about the open call and answer questions. A livestreamed event was also hosted on social media to promote the open call and encourage submissions.		

Table 3. Decision-making process

Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
<b>CONSULTATION</b>				
<a href="#">Connecting to Congress Online Town Halls on the Covid-19 emergency</a> <sup>1</sup>	No	The trade-off of reopening the economy too soon and risking additional COVID-19 infections, compared to waiting too long to re-open and prolonging economic damage. What criteria (conditions) should be used to decide when to reopen a community (e.g., when an effective treatment is widely available). What policy proposals they support (e.g., expanding test centres).	No recommendations or decisions were made and information about how the town halls influenced decisions by members of Congress is not reported. However, the research team responsible for the town halls suggest there is ongoing research to understand how members of Congress use the information that was communicated to them. <sup>1</sup>	Participants could vote on policy proposals. They were not directly involved in making decisions or recommendations.
<a href="#">Deliberative Consultation on Trade-offs Related to Using 'CovidSafe' Contact Tracing Technology</a> <sup>2</sup>	No	Is legislation supporting the COVIDSafe app appropriate? What they would recommend if there was a sustained increase in Covid-19 cases.	No mention is made of presenting the participants judgements to decision-makers or of their judgements being used in actual decisions.	There was a poll of participants views. They were not involved in actual decisions or recommendations to the government.

Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
<a href="#">Scottish Crowdsourcing Exercise "Coronavirus (COVID-19): framework for decision making"</a>	No	The platform allowed registered users to submit ideas. Participants were encouraged to provide a title for their idea and to explain 'why the contribution is important'. Users could rate any of the ideas on a five-star scale, and/or provide comments.	All ideas were analysed and categorised and fed back internally to ministers as well as to policy teams. A daily briefing was circulated to different people and departments in the government, and there were requests for different specific topic briefs from different departments, which was more of a deep dive into the work – for example, people asking 'There are people posting about recycling centres a lot, can you summarise that?' or, 'What's being said about schools?' There were about four or five topic briefs produced during the work, and there were some specific asks from people with interest, for example on test and trace, on shielding, and on technology. After the platform closed, it was identified that there were some key options being worked on by policy teams that seemed to adhere quite nicely to what the public were saying – like more outdoor exercise and no solitary sports – and the analysis team was asked to go back in to the data to confirm what was said. <sup>3</sup>	Participants did not directly participate in making decisions.

Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
<a href="#">Climate Assembly UK and the Covid-19 crisis</a>	No	<p>Participants were asked four broad questions:<sup>13</sup> Does the experience of the coronavirus and the lockdown make you feel differently about how the UK should get to Net Zero? Or do you feel the same?</p> <p>Do you agree or disagree that steps taken by the government to help the economy recover should be designed to help achieve Net Zero? Do you think lifestyles will change after the lockdown? Or will they go back to how they were before?</p> <p>As lockdown eases, do you agree or disagree that the government, employers and/or others should take steps to encourage lifestyles to change to be more compatible with reaching Net Zero? Following the discussion, participants voted on the two additional questions related to economic recovery and lifestyle changes.</p>	<p>The interim report was released ahead of the full report to inform the Parliament's and Government's responses to the COVID-19 crisis. In a letter, the Chairs of all six commissioning House of Commons Select Committees encouraged the Prime Minister to consider the views of the assembly members in its response to the pandemic.<sup>12</sup></p>	<p>Participants made recommendations. They did not participate in decisions and no direct communication with the government was reported.<sup>16</sup></p>

Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
<a href="#">#LockDownDebate: Rapid online deliberation on contact tracing</a>	No	The four objectives were: - Influencing research content by defining the relevant questions that need to be explored to inform the design of policy around contact tracing - Generating timely research data and contributing to the evidence base on relevant public perceptions and values in relation to contact tracing in time to inform policy making and design - Influencing research strategy by demonstrating to research commissioners that inclusive, deliberative research can be done online in policy-relevant timescales - Testing and learning from an approach to conducting deliberation online, asynchronously, and under shorter timescales than typical deliberation	This was a pilot project that aimed to test a methodology that would help integrate public deliberation into decision-making processes in an ever-changing context that requires rapid public input. There were plans have conversations with a range of government organisations about the insights from this work to influence and shape and change policy, across the UK. There were also plans for a policy stakeholder roundtable. <sup>15</sup> However, use of the judgements made by participants in decisions was not reported.	Participants did not make recommendations or decisions. The process was run independently, without working directly with the government. <sup>55</sup>
<a href="#">Citizens' Panel – Planning the West Midlands' Recovery</a>	The panel developed a set of advice or 'principles' that they hoped would guide the West Midlands Recovery Coordination Group in the delivery of its plan. <sup>18</sup>	At the end of the deliberative process, the final outputs were a list of priorities that participants wished to see in the recovery plan and the set of principles to guide the West Midlands Recovery Coordination Group as it delivered the plan.	The panel made 6 recommendations about controlling the pandemic, physical and mental health, education, jobs and business.	Summary sentences from across the panel were synthesised, then reviewed and written through a final time by a representative group of 6 panellists, to reach this set of "citizens' priorities for recovery." <sup>18</sup>

Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
<a href="#">Oregon Citizens' Assembly on Covid-19 Recovery</a>	Participants prioritised 6 principles as the top factors for decision-makers to consider, from a lengthy list of potential principles identified by the Assembly.	The participants made recommendations under two topic areas that they chose to focus on: housing and education. The recommendations sought to answer questions about the relationship between the pandemic and inequalities in social and economic structures. The questions were chosen by the assembly from among several questions submitted by a bipartisan selection of state legislators.	Policy recommendations that at least two-thirds of the participants supported were summarised in a final report. <sup>19</sup> The recommendations had negligible impact on the Oregon state government's COVID-19 response. <sup>56</sup> Though a handful of senators submitted questions to the panel at the outset and a state senator was present to hear their recommendations, there is no direct evidence that the legislature considered these recommendations.	Group work was often conducted simultaneously in a single GoogleDoc, with inconsistency across small groups in how inclusive that technology was for panellists. In some cases, small-group moderators managed the group's document but in other groups a panellist would take the reins on editing, with the others following along. Simultaneous editing of a collective document often meant eight or more individuals were altering the document making it difficult to track a specific small discussion and provide feedback. This difficulty was worsened by the fact that panellists were charged with identifying a set of core principles and then developing two separate sets of recommendations regarding government response to COVID-19— one on housing and one on education. Thus, it is not surprising that survey data revealed some panellists becoming unsure of their opportunities to express themselves in the later stages of the process. <sup>56</sup>

Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
<a href="#">Dialogue and Deliberative Workshops on Covid-19 and the NHS (National Health Service)</a> <sup>20</sup>	The workshop comprised plenary discussions with experts introducing the notion of prioritisation in elective care, followed by smaller breakout group discussions and exercises that pushed participants to make decisions and start formulating principles on prioritisation.	During the final workshop, the generated expectations were presented back to participants. In doing so, it was explained to participants how the expectations had been generated (i.e. through a synthesis of findings in the previous workshops) and that they were the research team's reflection of what participants told them. Each of the ten groups were encouraged to discuss the expectations in turn. Participants were asked whether they thought (1) they reflected the discussions held in their respective groups, (2) they should be reformulated or reworded, and (3) whether there was anything missing. Each expectation was then refined and presented back to the participants at the end of the fourth and final workshop.	The intended output was an informed and considered set of expectations to guide future planning and further engagement as further changes are made in response to the pandemic. "We are introducing a number of initiatives, supported and informed by this project, to ensure that every Londoner can access the NHS when they need us as safely as possible." (David Sloman, NHS regional director in London)	The deliberation culminated in the development of a set of expectations (or principles) - values or beliefs. These included recommendations, such as: "Decisions around who should be prioritised for elective procedures should be driven primarily by clinical severity of the patient. ..." and "In an effort to reduce the risk of spread of Covid-19, the NHS should restrict access to A&E and urgent treatment centres for only those who most need these services, ..."
<a href="#">Online Public Dialogues on Covid-19 Winter Preparedness</a>	No	The workshops explored public views on four areas of preparation for the winter: minimising Covid-19 transmission; minimising the spread of other winter diseases such as flu; optimising healthcare organisation to deal with the backlog of non-Covid care and optimising public health surveillance systems. The groups found it harder to engage with areas of planning beyond immediately dealing with Covid-19. <sup>22</sup>	The findings outlined a variety of perspectives. <sup>21</sup> The report made recommendations for communications.	Participants did not participate in making decisions or recommendations.

Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
<a href="#">Nantes Métropole Citizens' Convention</a>	No	The participants reflected on their experience and arrived at 11 aspirations for "a metropolis that better protects people isolated by the crisis". The aspirations included multiple recommendations. <sup>57</sup>	The organiser wrote the first version of the report based on the participants' discussions. <sup>27 30 31</sup>	A reading committee of about 10 participants proofread the report. At the last session all the participants reviewed the report.
<a href="#">Scottish Parliament Citizens' Panel on Covid-19</a> <sup>41</sup>	Participants were asked to reflect how four harms can be used to evaluate the impact of different strategies and levers that could be used to respond to Covid-19. They rated these from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest) importance: direct health impacts (9.7), health impacts not directly related to Covid-19 (7), societal impacts (7.6), economic impacts (6.5).	Although the vote regarding the importance of the four harms was indicative and not directly tied to the final recommendations, it allowed participants to consider the importance of the four harms as a way of evaluating and producing recommendations in the final session.	Participants were asked to identify and rate suggested recommendations on an online platform.	Facilitators collated the suggestions that achieved an overall rating of 2.5/5.0 or above to form the basis of draft recommendations. The draft recommendations were grouped into four themes and the participants were divided into four small groups, with each group focusing on refining the recommendations for one of the four themes. In a plenary session, the lead facilitator gave a summary of each groups' refined recommendations to all participants. The participants had an opportunity to provide feedback on their support for recommendations and to identify others that could be refined, further clarified, or removed. Following small group discussions with stakeholders, the participants split into four small groups again to refine the recommendations and reach a consensus.
<a href="#">Citizens' Assembly on restrictions and recommendations in response to the COVID-19 pandemic</a>	No	Support of restrictions.	This was an experiment comparing the effect of health experts versus social/legal experts on participants support of restrictions, and the effect of the order of the expert hearings. <sup>43</sup>	None.



Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
<a href="#">Conference on the Future of Europe</a>	No	Citizens' Panels came up with recommendations that fed into the overall Conference deliberations, in particular, into the Conference Plenaries. Anybody could share their ideas on a multilingual digital platform, under one of the ten topics. It was also possible to comment on other people's ideas. <sup>44</sup>	Participants made recommendations on specific themes, including health and Covid-19: that an assessment of the impact of Covid-19, including evaluating responses such as the digital corona certificate, the need to revalue healthcare workers and the lessons to be learned to prepare for and combat future pandemics. <sup>58</sup>	A Conference Plenary was set up to debate the recommendations from the national and European Citizens' Panels, grouped by themes. The plenary included citizens representing European and national Citizens' Panels and events alongside representatives of EU institutions and advisory bodies, elected representatives at national, regional, and local levels, as well as representatives of civil society and social partners. After the recommendations were presented by and discussed with citizens, the plenary had to put forward its proposals on a consensual basis to the Executive Board. <sup>44</sup>
Medical-Religious community engagement conference call series <sup>4</sup>	No	Participants identified concerns related to Covid-19, and strategies for addressing the challenges and successes. Participants could give feedback on the calls via a survey.	No decisions or recommendations were made.  Participants could discuss Covid-19 related recommendations in actionable manners that could be adapted to individual communities, including allocating resources (e.g., facemasks). Participants could in turn impact their own local communities. The calls also served to identify and correct misinformation in the community.	Actions in local communities could be taken based on the content of community calls.

Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
Red Cross and Red Crescent approach to using community feedback to guide Covid-19 response in sub-Saharan Africa <sup>5</sup>	No	Red Cross and Red Crescent workers provided forms to record comments from the community during risk communication and community engagement activities. Community feedback was also collected via digital means during lockdowns.	No decisions or recommendations were made.  This regular analysis of feedback informed the development of information products to address rumours and concerns and respond to communities' most frequent questions. Short videos featuring health experts are produced and shared via social media and WhatsApp, with themes selected from the most common feedback topics	Strategies to address comments were incorporated regularly into practice.
Collaboration Between Faith-Based Communities and Public Health <sup>6</sup>	No	Panel members made suggestions for continuing their practices in safe and hygienic ways. Some of their suggestions were accepted, and the public health unit responded to others using grids to explain how risks outweighed benefits.	Experience from this initiative led to formalizing the involvement of the transcultural psychiatry team with the creation of a program to address "inequities experienced by marginalized groups in the context of the pandemic by acting as a catalyst for actions and partnerships with key actors" <sup>6</sup> . "These experiences also led to the writing of a mediation guide in collaboration with public health" <sup>6</sup> .	Not explicitly. The absence of decision-makers in these negotiations was an obstacle to putting in motion suggestions from the community that were acceptable from a public health lens, such as opening the mikvah and providing individual in-person counselling.
First Nations Community Panels <sup>7</sup>	No	Panel members came up with strategies for government to privilege First Nations Peoples voices in pandemic planning and responses. Participants had opportunities to include feedback from the local community in their final list of recommendations.	Panel members co-produced a recommendations report with researchers which made recommendations on specific issues related to including the perspectives and needs of First Nations People in Covid-19 policy and planning.	Recommendation report was submitted to health policy decision-makers for consideration.

Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
<b>INVOLVEMENT</b>				
<a href="#">Bristol Citizens' Assembly</a> <sup>45</sup>	Principles prioritised by over half of all Assembly members*: 1. Reducing inequality – greatest action needs to be taken for those with greatest need - 78% (45 votes). 2. Affordable housing, inclusive housing policies, and no homelessness – 60% (35 votes). 3. Sustainability: environment and economic – 55% (32 votes). 4. Young people at the heart of COVID recovery and involved in decision-making – 54% (31 votes). 5. Accessibility of essential services for all – 53% (31 votes). 6. Prioritise wellbeing and mental health – 50% (29 votes). 7. Urgency of the climate crisis – 50% (29 votes). * Each assembly member was asked to pick the 10 principles they thought were most important.	A citywide survey during August and September 2020 identified issues that were of a high priority to residents of Bristol. Four of those issues were identified as a starting point to thinking about what specifically the citizens' assembly should look at in relation to 'How do we recover from COVID-19 and create a better future for all in Bristol?' Speakers presented to the assembly on three topics and participants deliberated and worked together to develop recommendations.	Participants voted on recommendations.	Participants voted on 17 recommendations.
<a href="#">Citizens' committee on vaccination against Covid-19</a> <sup>59</sup>	No	Participants were asked a series of questions about communication about Covid vaccination.	Participants made recommendations on communication and access to vaccination.	Draft recommendations were finalised at a plenary session. The recommendations were proofread by five volunteers.

Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
<a href="#">Camden Health and Care Citizens' Assembly</a> <sup>48</sup>	Participations identified expectations for three priority areas. Expectations are standards which they want the council and its partners to adhere to when delivering services and affecting change. They are not necessarily specific actions but are principles to follow when developing and implementing changes to the local health and social care system.	Participants identified three priority areas to focus on throughout the process, investigated the experiences of their family, friends, and neighbours in relation to Covid-19, identified their expectations around the priority areas, members reviewed the expectations across all three priority areas, ranked them, and considered who could do what to support them.	Participants made recommendations for achieving their expectations.	All expectations were considered equally important as no consensus emerged. The participants individually, and then in small groups, deliberated on how local services, community groups and charities, and individuals could help achieve the expectations.
<b>COLLABORATION</b>				
<a href="#">Extraordinary online session of the Citizens' Convention on Climate: Finding a way out of the Covid-19 crisis</a>	In the face of the emergency, the Convention determined that some of their proposals would make it possible to "contribute to economic recovery, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and, undeniably, improve our collective health and well-being, while considering the most vulnerable populations." Based on these criteria, the Convention chose to share approximately one third of its proposals with the President of the Republic and the Government before they were voted on or finalised. <sup>49</sup>	50 of 150 proposed measures drafted by the Convention were communicated to the executive to contribute to the national effort. The Convention chose to share the proposals with the executive without delay (especially considering their effects on key criteria): "In the face of the emergency, some of our measures would make it possible to contribute both to a revival of the economy, to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and, undeniably, to the improvement of our collective health and well-being, while taking into account the most vulnerable populations." <sup>50</sup>	Participants had online discussions about the ins and outs of a plan to find a way out of the crisis and climate and social issues related to it.	The members of the Convention chose not to share the proposals with French society before they could hold the final session. During the final session, they finalised, voted, and presented all their proposals publicly.
<a href="#">COVID-19 Culturally &amp; Linguistically Diverse Community Forums: South Australia</a>	No	The participants had opportunity to express their needs, challenges, and concerns. <sup>53</sup>	The insights gained from the forum and the data collected from a survey was used to inform government communications, messaging, and policy. <sup>54</sup>	Participants were not directly involved in decisions.

Initiative	Explicit criteria	Judgements made by participants	Use of judgements in decisions or recommendations	Participation in making decisions or recommendations
Crowdsourcing communication for prevention strategies <sup>8</sup>	No	Participants created their own video content to communicate public health information on hand hygiene or social distancing.	No decisions or recommendations were made.  Participants' video content was used to support "community ownership of pandemic messaging." <sup>8</sup>	Participants were not directly involved in decisions.
Crowdsourcing Approaches to University Community Engagement and strategic planning during Covid-19 <sup>9</sup>	No	Participants were engaged both within the judging and organizing committees (finalizing the call for submissions, promoting the call, collecting, and evaluating submissions) and in submitting proposals. Those who submitted proposals could choose to submit to one or more categories (public health campaign, inclusive digital dialogue, collective action or re-thinking safety). Participants were also asked following the competition if they were interested in implementing their ideas or enrolling in a course for credit to facilitate implementation of their ideas.	No decisions or recommendations were made. The open call was conducted independently of university leadership's decision-making regarding the fall semester.  "Open call data collected in this study may provide a formal mechanism to better understand community concerns during COVID-19. The findings of the current study provided an early warning signal about faculty, staff, and student concerns related to reopening. These findings demonstrate how crowdsourcing can provide novel insights into community concerns that thus far have been absent from institutional responses to the pandemic" <sup>9</sup>  Some submissions expressed concern with in-person reopening that were communicated to university leadership. This did not prevent a reopening process characterized by substantial COVID-19 transmission, and eventually a move to online learning.	"All of the finalists and runners-up received support from Innovate Carolina, a UNC office focused on innovation and entrepreneurship. For runners-up, this support included outreach from Innovate Carolina to provide relevant resources for further development of their ideas (e.g., linkage to entrepreneurship programs and events). For finalists, Innovate Carolina organized one-on-one meetings to discuss the next steps in implementing their ideas and ways that the office could provide support. In addition, the Carolina Collective organizing committee met with 4 university leaders to share top-scoring ideas and promote implementation and shared communications-related submissions with a pan-university communications committee." <sup>9</sup>

Table 4. Critical thinking

Initiative	Were participants expected to think critically?	Was their ability to think critically considered?	If participants were expected to think critically, What support was given to help them think critically?	Was the basis for expert judgements explained?
<b>CONSULTATION</b>				
<a href="#">Connecting to Congress Online Town Halls on the Covid-19 emergency</a> <sup>1</sup>	Yes	No	Not reported The “high-quality, fact-based issue guide” and information provided by “subject matter experts” who attended the town halls are not available.	Not reported.
<a href="#">Deliberative Consultation on Trade-offs Related to Using ‘CovidSafe’ Contact Tracing Technology</a> <sup>2</sup>	Yes	“The method [deliberative workshops] assumes that people can think in a reasoned way and change their views when warranted by evidence.” Participants’ underpinning reasoning and dissenting views were explored.	Participants heard (sometimes opposing) evidence from experts and were given opportunities to ask these experts questions. Provided. It is not reported whether the experts helped the participants to think critically about the judgements they were asked to make. Before the workshop, they were given materials containing “factual information” and covering a range of perspectives. That material did not include support for thinking critically about the claims made in that material or other relevant claims.	Not reported.
<a href="#">Scottish Crowdsourcing Exercise ‘Coronavirus (COVID-19): framework for decision making’</a>	Yes	Yes	“The Dialogue feature that asks ‘why is this idea important’ is great because it makes the respondent think twice about what they’re saying and then argue the case for their idea.” <sup>3</sup>	Not relevant.
<a href="#">Climate Assembly UK and the Covid-19 crisis</a>	Yes	Yes	During Weekend 2 of the Assembly, a professor of democratic politics presented on “considering evidence”. <sup>11</sup>	No. <sup>13</sup>

Initiative	Were participants expected to think critically?	Was their ability to think critically considered?	If participants were expected to think critically, What support was given to help them think critically?	Was the basis for expert judgements explained?
<a href="#">#LockDownDebate: Rapid online deliberation on contact tracing</a>	Over three weeks the participants assessed the evidence and debated and deliberated on the requirements that would make a Government contact tracing app trusted and justified. <sup>16</sup>	“Deliberative processes are based on the idea that views can change, over time, through exposure to new ideas, new information, new arguments, or simply in different contexts. That’s the fundamental difference between dialogic or deliberative communication, which aims to explore the differences in opinion in a relative frame, and dialectic, which poses statements in opposition to each other.” <sup>60</sup> Principles of deliberative practice 1) A learning experience, and concerned with evidence: Participants are required to learn in some depth about the topic under consideration, and interrogate the evidence from different perspectives before reaching a conclusion. 2) Long-form and reflective: It’s important that participants have time to develop their views over a period of time, rather be called on to give initial, surface reactions.” <sup>61</sup>	Not reported.	Not reported.
<a href="#">Citizens’ Panel – Planning the West Midlands’ Recovery</a>	Yes	The overarching objective for this piece of research was to help ensure that the priorities for regional recovery agreed by West Midlands Combined Authority ( political leaders are guided by the informed recommendations of its citizens. <sup>18</sup>	Not reported	Not reported
<a href="#">Oregon Citizens’ Assembly on Covid-19 Recovery</a>	Yes	In the first presentation ( <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cFEbAYj0JYE">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cFEbAYj0JYE</a> ) participants were encouraged to “Be open to new ideas & Listen with care”.	Not reported	Not reported

Initiative	Were participants expected to think critically?	Was their ability to think critically considered?	If participants were expected to think critically, What support was given to help them think critically?	Was the basis for expert judgements explained?
<a href="#">Dialogue and Deliberative Workshops on Covid-19 and the NHS (National Health Service)</a>	Yes	No	Not reported	Not reported
<a href="#">Online Public Dialogues on Covid-19 Winter Preparedness</a>	Not clear	Not reported	Not reported	No expert presentations
<a href="#">Nantes Métropole Citizens' Convention</a>	Yes	Experts were questioned by the participants. <sup>57</sup>	Not reported	Not reported
<a href="#">Scottish Parliament Citizens' Panel on Covid-19</a>	Yes	In addition to a presentation on assessing evidence and critical thinking, participants were invited to develop conversation guidelines, share and discuss their experience of the pandemic, and to begin reflecting in small groups on potential recommendations to be explored further, based on the discrepancy they see between their experience and the measures in place.	An expert delivered a presentation to the participants about assessing evidence and applying critical thinking during the process ( <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AkMUcndZeBY">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AkMUcndZeBY</a> ). <sup>41</sup>	Not reported
<a href="#">Citizens' Assembly on restrictions and recommendations in response to the COVID-19 pandemic</a>	Yes	After video presentations, each small group was asked to formulate questions for the experts just introduced. The participants were instructed to focus on the experts' field of specialization and formulate questions that these particular experts would likely be able to answer.	Not reported	Not reported



Initiative	Were participants expected to think critically?	If participants were expected to think critically,		Was the basis for expert judgements explained?
		Was their ability to think critically considered?	What support was given to help them think critically?	
<a href="#">Conference on the Future of Europe</a> <sup>44</sup>	Yes	Citizens were asked to formulate justifications for their orientations (as the first step towards producing recommendations).	Not reported	During the second session, with the support of experts and fact-checkers, the citizens identified and discussed specific issues and drafted 'orientations' for each of the thematic streams they had identified during the first session. Particular attention was paid to ensuring balanced groups of experts in terms of gender and geographical diversity and balanced inputs from each of them, via extensive briefings providing citizens with facts and/or the state of play of the debate while avoiding sharing personal opinions.
Medical-Religious community engagement conference call series <sup>4</sup>	Yes	No	Not reported	Experts presented short Covid-19 updates during each call and answered questions submitted by participants. The authors did not report whether the experts' background or evidence behind advice and recommendations was presented.
Red Cross and Red Crescent approach to using community feedback to guide Covid-19 response in sub-Saharan Africa <sup>5</sup>	No	No	Not reported	In some countries Red Cross volunteers meet with community leaders and share updates on Covid-19 and answer questions. The authors did not report the basis for expert knowledge and judgments.

Initiative	Were participants expected to think critically?	If participants were expected to think critically, Was their ability to think critically considered?		Was the basis for expert judgements explained?
		Was their ability to think critically considered?	What support was given to help them think critically?	
Collaboration Between Faith-Based Communities and Public Health <sup>6</sup>	Yes.	No	Not reported	In some cases the experts provided grids showing the how the risks of some activities would outweigh the benefits.
First Nations Community Panels <sup>7</sup>	Yes, Check-in session/s were held to understand if the panels changed their position following the evidence and deliberation days.	No	Not reported	Yes. "Panel members received a booklet with information about the research team and expert presenters, the panel process and questions for panel members to consider and respond to. Participants listened to evidence from expert presenters...[and] engaged with the experts following their presentations with questions and opportunities to challenge or seek clarification about the presented evidence" <sup>7</sup>

Initiative	Were participants expected to think critically?	Was their ability to think critically considered?	If participants were expected to think critically, What support was given to help them think critically?	Was the basis for expert judgements explained?
<b>INVOLVEMENT</b>				
<a href="#">Bristol Citizens' Assembly</a>	Yes	Not reported	Not reported	The role of the independent advisory group was to support the citizens' assembly process by providing advice and oversight to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The assembly is focused on the key themes that have been highlighted, and</li> <li>● The evidence and materials are comprehensive, accurate and balanced and perceived as such by the outside world, and</li> <li>● Independence of the materials produced as background for assembly members.<sup>45</sup></li> </ul>
<a href="#">Citizens' committee on vaccination against Covid-19</a>	Yes	Not reported, but the committee recommended: "the citizen collective recommends providing clear information on the government's decision-making logic. Provided by the government and supported by the opinion of scientific representatives, this information must allow everyone to understand and adhere to the decisions taken and thus maintain a bond of trust between government and citizens." <sup>47</sup>	Not reported	Not reported
<a href="#">Camden Health and Care Citizens' Assembly</a>	Yes	The role of the participants was to "draw on their personal experiences, group discussions and what they learned throughout this process, to develop a set of expectations for the local partnership to consider when implementing future change to the health and care system." <sup>48</sup>	University College London's role was to advise and support the assembly approach with academic input. <sup>48</sup>	Not reported
<b>COLLABORATION</b>				

Initiative	Were participants expected to think critically?	Was their ability to think critically considered?	If participants were expected to think critically, What support was given to help them think critically?	Was the basis for expert judgements explained?
<a href="#">Extraordinary online session of the Citizens' Convention on Climate: Finding a way out of the Covid-19 crisis</a>	Yes	<p>"No specific skills are required. Participants will work with different stakeholders, experts in the topics discussed and lawyers who will help them translate their proposals into legal terms." <sup>62</sup></p> <p>During these two days of work, the members of the Convention had the opportunity to discuss the ins and outs of a plan to find a way out of the crisis and the climate and social issues related to it. <sup>50</sup></p>	<p>"Based on hearings of experts with conflicting opinions and summaries of research (by academic experts, international bodies and civil society organizations), the citizens selected at random will draw up proposals for laws and regulations" <sup>62</sup></p> <p>A Governance Committee called on several research centres to form a team of resource people from different disciplines to answer questions of the Convention and assist with fact checking. <sup>63</sup></p>	Not reported
<a href="#">COVID-19 Culturally &amp; Linguistically Diverse Community Forums: South Australia</a>	Not clear	"The role of members was to draw upon their personal experiences, participate in group discussions, and share what they had learned from the process to develop the three policy principles."	Not reported	Not reported
Crowdsourcing communication for prevention strategies <sup>8</sup>	Yes	Not explicitly. However, all eligible submissions had to provide a clear message with accurate information from a public health perspective.	Not reported	Not reported
Crowdsourcing Approaches to University Community Engagement and strategic planning during Covid-19 <sup>9</sup>	Yes	Not explicitly. However, all submissions were evaluated according to their potential effect on the safety and well-being of the university community, innovation, feasibility, and inclusivity.	Not reported	Yes. Criteria for judgments of the submissions were made clear during the call for proposals.

Table 5. Impacts, evaluation, and lessons learned

Initiative	Evaluation	Impacts	Lessons learned
<b>CONSULTATION</b>			
<a href="#">Connecting to Congress Online Town Halls on the Covid-19 emergency</a> <sup>1</sup>	Formal evaluation not available. After the town hall, the research team analysed pre- and post-survey data to show how the town hall affected constituent opinion of the Member and COVID-19 policy actions (Participedia). Surveys of participants in similar town halls on other topics (immigration, and torture and rendition) indicated that trust and approval of members of Congress increased. <sup>64</sup> Participants also found the town halls “very valuable for our democracy” and would like to participate in future town halls.	“our research is ongoing; constituents and members have informed one another, yet now we as researchers are tasked with both understanding how members use the information that was communicated to them, and whether constituents modified their behavior or updated their preferences after close interactions with their representatives.” “we continue to interview participating member offices to discern and track the effects on participating in [deliberative town halls] on their legislative and broader representational activity, and we purposely do this a number of months after the sessions to take place in order to give us the opportunity to observe long-term effects on the behavior of members of Congress and their offices.” <sup>1</sup>	“We have worked to evaluate which adapted aspects of the events were most fruitful and impactful for the participants on each end of the conversation. One of the most pressing tasks was to learn from this set of experiences to solidify a set of best practices for using technology to facilitate meaningful two-way conversation between representatives and the represented amid a crisis. Preliminary analysis points to the bipartisan, multi-member events being particularly well-suited for facilitating these important dialogues.” “Much of the legislative process takes place within committees, and in doing this work, we can prepare ourselves to best equip Congress with the information they need to make informed decisions while legislating—in all steps of the legislative process—and empower constituents to voice their opinions to their elected officials during the next crisis.”
<a href="#">Deliberative Consultation on Trade-offs Related to Using 'CovidSafe' Contact Tracing Technology</a> <sup>2</sup>	A formal analysis of the reasoning behind participants views has been published. <sup>2</sup>	None reported.	None reported.

Initiative	Evaluation	Impacts	Lessons learned
<a href="#">Scottish Crowdsourcing Exercise "Coronavirus (COVID-19): framework for decision making"</a>	Formal evaluation not available. A content editor for Delib, which supplied the <a href="#">digital platform</a> that was used, interviewed the team behind the exercise. <sup>3 65</sup>	The Scottish government committed to engaging the people of Scotland in deciding on steps to lift Covid restrictions, and chose crowdsourcing to do this. <sup>65</sup> In a foreword to an overview of public engagement in decision-making, the First Minister of Scotland wrote: "Clearly it is incumbent upon us a Government to take those views into account. I can assure those that contributed that their ideas and comments are being used to inform the decisions we will be taking on moving out of the current lockdown." Daily briefs of findings were circulated, and specific topic briefs were requested within the government. Beyond this, it is unclear to what extent the findings had an impact on decision making.	<p>The following lessons were elicited in interviews with the government team behind the crowdsourcing:<sup>3</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was important to publicly feedback findings quickly rather than just feeding back to ministers and policy teams. "It was vital to demonstrate that we were listening to people and that their input was being used to inform how the government was making decisions. We want to keep doing this, and to do that we need people's good will, and we need their trust that we take them seriously."</li> <li>- The project was collaborative within the digital engagement team, between the analysts and moderators, and between policy teams and different departments. This essential to the success of the project.</li> <li>- In the final report, it was mentioned that they couldn't reach people who weren't online, and that those who did respond are those who were likely to respond anyway. It is necessary to think creatively about reaching those groups. "The audience is a self-selecting opt-in audience, and it isn't reflective of the views of everyone, so you do need to balance that."</li> <li>- The process requires resource to facilitate it and ensure that it's a success. "You can't just publish something and wander off."</li> <li>- "The Dialogue feature that asks 'why is this idea important' is great because it makes the respondent think twice about what they're saying and then argue the case for their idea. If you look at some of the conversations that went on, that was a big part of why it was successful."</li> <li>- Another feature of Dialogue that facilitated the process was "the ability to comment on other people's ideas, with the ability to facilitate a conversation."</li> </ul>

Initiative	Evaluation	Impacts	Lessons learned
<a href="#">Climate Assembly UK and the Covid-19 crisis</a>	A formal evaluation of lessons learned has been published. <sup>66 67</sup>	<p>A survey of assembly members' views of the assembly found that:<sup>14</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- 90% of assembly members 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' that 'assemblies like this should be used more often to inform government and parliament decision making'.</li><li>- taking part in the assembly impacted positively on assembly members' appetite and confidence to engage in political decision-making. 88% of assembly members 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' that 'I feel more confident to engage in political decision making as a result of being involved in this citizens' assembly'.</li><li>- The same percentage 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' that 'taking part in this citizens' assembly made them want to be more involved in other aspects of decision making'.</li></ul>	See Formal evaluations table.

[#LockDownDebate: Rapid online deliberation on contact tracing](#)

Formal evaluation not available.  
The organisers reflected on lessons learned.

- "By the end of the process, participants were very aware of the unequal health and economic impacts of the virus and wanted any strategy to ensure that such inequalities would be addressed, rather than worsened, as part of the recovery process. They had shared their experiences and came to respect each other's perspectives. Importantly they wanted the Government to do the same."<sup>16</sup>  
- No other impacts are reported.

- "The debate demonstrated that if you give groups of people time to talk to experts on an equal footing, they respond with very nuanced and contextualised opinions."<sup>16</sup>  
- "Initially, participants struggled with the uncertainty of the subject matter. They found it difficult to say what they thought when there was so little concrete information about the virus or potential solutions. As the deliberation got underway, however, they began to see this uncertainty as a key part of their views."<sup>16</sup>  
- The only barrier to participation that people mentioned was when they had connectivity issues, which sometimes meant that they struggled joining a Zoom call, or they were on the call and things were kind of going in and out and they missed things. What we tried to do to cover that was to have live notetaking in the plenary sessions and in the discussion sessions for the slides and the notes on the online platform for people to look in their own time. Some people liked that because they found it a lot to absorb there and then, and they wanted to go back and look at it and they appreciated the chance to be able to do that. And if people had had to miss a session for whatever reason, they then caught up.<sup>15</sup>

[Ada Lovelace Institute](#), [Traverse](#), [Involve](#), and [Bang the Table](#) shared their learning week by week through the project.<sup>60</sup>

- Compared with the sortition approaches an open invite to local online forums and groups was crude. However, within about a week a sample was recruited that was within spitting distance of national levels for age, ethnicity, and approximated social grade, split across rural and urban populations. The method of recruitment (mutual aid groups, local resident forums) leans heavily female,



Initiative	Evaluation	Impacts	Lessons learned
			<p>and this needed to be managed actively from the start of recruitment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- With 35 people, the chat function can feel a bit frantic, but it worked well for information giving. As soon as we broke out into smaller groups (around 6-7 people) the dynamic was much better and easier to facilitate. This was easy to manage in Zoom.</li> <li>- Feedback from our facilitators was that some of the usual dynamics (e.g. more dominant personalities getting more air time) were strongly present and a little trickier to manage online. Finding that the process of establishing a productive discourse takes more time.</li> <li>- One of the things we hear most often in feedback from deliberative events is that people enjoy the experience of learning. For most adults learning completely new topics just isn't part of their daily lives, so it's a stimulating and exciting process.</li> <li>- Supporting participants to form relationships with each other is more difficult online than face-to-face and might benefit from strategies to address this.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Citizens' Panel – Planning the West Midlands' Recovery</a>	Formal evaluation not available.	None reported	None reported
<a href="#">Oregon Citizens' Assembly on Covid-19 Recovery</a>	Several formal evaluations have been published. <sup>56 68-70</sup>	See Formal evaluations table.	See Formal evaluations table.
<a href="#">Dialogue and Deliberative Workshops on Covid-19 and the NHS (National Health Service)</a>	Formal evaluation not available.	None reported	None reported
<a href="#">Online Public Dialogues on Covid-19 Winter Preparedness</a>	Formal evaluation not available.	None reported	None reported

### [Nantes Métropole Citizens' Convention](#)

Formal evaluation not available.

The government committed to responding to the convention's proposals and to monitoring and publicly reporting on progress.

"The project manager for digital citizen dialogue and a citizen dialogue officer published a booklet describing the thinking behind strategies that were used.<sup>24</sup>

- According to the General Manager of Nantes Métropole and City of Nantes services,<sup>36</sup> all the proposals were forwarded to the various departments according to their areas of intervention. Everyone looked at how the action of their department could change in concrete terms to respond to it. The citizens' opinions contributed either to strengthening, reformulating, or reprioritizing intentions that were already there. Some proposals were complicated to implement. It had to be explained it could not be done right away or why it could not be done, and sometimes a different response to the expectation was needed - particularly for certain housing issues. Finally, there were proposals that were the responsibility of the State or the Region, for example, and it was necessary to call on these authorities and follow their response.

- On March 11, the members of the citizens' convention gave their opinion to the elected representatives of Nantes Métropole. July 7, the latter answered them.<sup>39</sup> The Métropole made 90 commitments. Among them, a strong ambition around health, a major point of the crisis, with a new public health policy on a metropolitan scale. The 24 municipalities of the Metropolis also proposed 70 responses at their level, including the networking of health professionals and the construction of nursing homes. Citizens reacted hotly. "We appreciate the honesty of your response, your sincere commitment," they point out. But what will be the role of citizens in the implementation of these plans? Where are the participatory projects and how will we be in continuous dialogue with you throughout this year?

- A first assessment of the commitments was presented June 27, 2022.<sup>40</sup> "The Citizens' Convention of Nantes was a first in France on the scale of a metropolis, underlines Johanna Rolland,

The opinion was intended to challenge elected officials, but the members of the Convention wanted the document to be understood more widely by the inhabitants of the metropolis: a direct style, simple but which takes into account the nuances of the debates, as therefore preferred. In view of the difficulty of writing collectively from a distance, a reading committee with volunteer citizens was set up. It was responsible for reviewing the first draft of the opinion to check, complete and adjust it.<sup>31</sup>

Ideas and best practices for each stage of a citizen workshop:<sup>24</sup>

#### **To mobilize and recruit a panel:**

- Present the approach by making people want to participate. The social networks of the community can be used to mobilize a large and diversified public, with a mass and multiplier effect. This calls for a specific communication campaign, targeting the desired audience, and inviting them to participate in the process according to the methods of participation.

- Propose fun and attractive forms to capture and arouse curiosity: quizzes, videos, photo contests, archive images
- Rely on virtual relays to disseminate the call for applications, spread via the digital networks of the partners.
- Encourage digital communities to participate depending on the subjects, an effort to get to know and mobilize influencers and communities of interest to be carried out before the launch of the procedures.
- Use the city's digital message media.

- Go to meet the public, and in particular those furthest away to explain the approach and to recruit in places chosen according to the people you want to reach: at the exits of supermarkets, in parks or at the foot of buildings....

- To facilitate the management of registrations for a citizen workshop, simple questionnaires can be

---

Mayor of Nantes and President of Nantes Métropole. It made it possible to speed up the implementation of a territorial project by renewing ways of doing things. It reflects the community's desire to be the spearhead of a new metropolis model based on people, respect for the living and on a deeply cooperative and inclusive spirit." One year after 102 commitments were made, a third (29) had been completed and 59 were in progress. 14 projects, based on preliminary studies, required building partnerships or finding resources.

constructed on the digital space for citizen dialogue: to be completed online individually from home, by the mediator if recruitment on the public space (via tablet for example) or in specific spaces. The challenge: to collect the information necessary for processing to ensure more diversity (gender, age, place of residence, contact details, etc.)

**To collect viewpoints:**

- To collect sensitive contributions, a variety of less conventional modes of expression: photos, videos, audio recording... will allow everyone to contribute, especially the youngest.
- To launch a debate and capture the points of view of the public who do not participate spontaneously - invite passers-by to react around a given theme, collect their testimonies... whether it is through walls of expression: the facilitators write for the participants, formulate and group the ideas on large panels...
- To receive contributions, whether individual or collective: The digital space for citizen dialogue can offer many methods of deposit and participation, adaptable to each project. Physically, consider, for example, the provision of suggestion boxes in public places or even Letters to be returned free of charge (for example, with postcards available throughout the city).
- Add a short form each time to find out who participated and collect the contact details of the contributor(s) who wish to be kept informed.

**To facilitate:**

- To facilitate is to bring a community to life. If certain aspects of conviviality, fundamental to participation, are eclipsed (snacks or festive pots), it is a question of being attentive to establishing a climate of benevolence: a sincere welcome, with attention to each one, a framework for discussion serene, a warm introduction to the session but also moments of breathing... In short, everyone feels
-

Initiative	Evaluation	Impacts	Lessons learned
			<p>comfortable participating in a collective, even behind their screen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participation is never spontaneous, and even less from a distance. Facilitation requires preparation time. Also, it is a question of thinking about the sequencing of an approach (what we want to land on and how), of the sequence of sessions, but also of preparing accessible information supports.</li> <li>- Prepare but in terms of participation nothing is mechanical. You also have to know how to step aside to adapt to the group, to its questions.</li> <li>- No need to reinvent everything, sometimes it's about using tools that work, with which you feel comfortable.</li> <li>- Between periods of contributions and sharing (in person or remotely), it is necessary to maintain the link with the participants. The quality of the relationship is also found outside the sessions with attention to the proper management of the mailing list, keeping the thread and the story of the process: via the dialogue space or by always taking care to recontextualize the subject.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Scottish Parliament Citizens' Panel on Covid-19</a>	Formal evaluation not available.	None reported	None reported
<a href="#">Citizens' Assembly on restrictions and recommendations in response to the COVID-19 pandemic</a>	This was a nonrandomised study that evaluated how the field of expert presenters influenced deliberation and its outcomes. <sup>42 43</sup>	See Formal evaluations table.	See Formal evaluations table.

### [Conference on the Future of Europe](#)

Formal evaluation not available. The High Level Advisory Group published a report in February 2022 on "What worked, what now, what next?"<sup>71</sup>

- "Ten months after its official launch, critics say that the Conference is in the doldrums. It has limited visibility, as most citizens are not even aware that it is taking place. Its Multilingual Digital Platform (MDP), albeit an innovative tool, has not generated widespread transnational discussions about the EU's future. The link between national and European events is weak, and, to date, the Conference Plenaries have failed to generate excitement or a sense of collective endeavour."  
 - "The ultimate success of the Conference hinges on the Union "[following] up on whatever is agreed." If this objective is not met, the EU would undermine the very rationale of the Conference and further widen the gap between citizens and politicians. Yet the road to final outcomes is still long."  
 - "Five 'must-dos' which look at the upcoming phase and argues for increasing the stakes of the Conference: giving citizens new opportunities before the end of the CoFoE process to exchange with their political representatives about their recommendations; boosting the transparency of the different elements of the process; translating citizens' recommendations into actionable proposals; and specifying the final path to and form of the CoFoE's outcome."

A comment published in August 2022 noted: "The Conference on the Future of Europe was heavily overshadowed by external events and its ability to contribute to the debate on necessary reforms was limited. The legitimacy of the representative citizens' panels was not sufficient to achieve that, nor was the plenary able to bridge the opposing interests between and within the EU institutions."<sup>72</sup>

"Grand rhetoric did little to overcome political realities. From the onset, the Conference lacked a sense of purpose and strong commitment from all member states. EU institutions and the vast majority of EU countries had drastically different opinions about the ultimate objectives of the Conference. Most governments were critical of the overall idea, expressing fears that the endeavour would raise expectations that the Union and its members would not be willing nor able to fulfil. By initiating a debate about the 'future of Europe' without ensuring the support of all those involved, the Conference got off on the wrong foot."

"The broadness of the themes, lack of time, weak links between transnational and (sub)national debates, and ambiguity of purpose emerge as lessons to be learned for similar future exercises."

"Four options on how to incorporate novel participatory elements in the democratic process: European citizens' deliberations on key legislative proposals; multilevel citizens' deliberations on major transformative topics; 'big tent' fora on the EU's strategic priorities; and European citizens' deliberations in conjunction with a European Convention."

**What worked:** the random selection of citizens, the logistics and organisation, participants' motivation, the results-driven process.

**What did not work:** the many broad themes, the lack of time, missing links between transnational and (sub)national debates, the ambiguous objective.

**What was learned:**

- Make the subject as precise as possible, avoiding broad topics.
- Allow more time for the process to unfold.
- Raise citizens' awareness and knowledge about the topic(s) discussed before deliberations start.
- Enhance the links between transnational and

Initiative	Evaluation	Impacts	Lessons learned
Medical-Religious community engagement conference call series <sup>4</sup>	<p>Stakeholder experience was evaluated using a survey distributed electronically following the calls to gather feedback on the calls, how the information obtained has been shared following the calls, and which topics they would like to have discussed on future calls.</p> <p>The researchers also collected data on how many callers dialled into each call, which specific COVID-19 health issues were requested and discussed, and any community outcomes that occurred due to these calls (e.g., requests to conduct additional calls for a congregation, ability to allocate community resources).</p>	<p>Information from the community calls were being shared after the calls by phone calls, texts and e-mails. Other participants shared the information with caregiver support groups, book clubs, community associations, Sunday school classes, and colleagues. In regards to topics that participants wanted addressed, these included mental health, antibody tests, and pharmacological responses, self-care during self-isolation, home care practices after being discharged from the hospital with a diagnosis of COVID-19, and the virus' effect on various races and ethnicities. Many of the participants on the calls expressed an interest in having the calls continued after the pandemic has dwindled to develop strategies and coping mechanisms on how to adapt to the new 'normal.' The calls also served to identify and correct any potentially harmful misinformation circulating among the communities. Finally, the calls resulted in questions from religious leaders of how to best prepare their congregations for re-opening services in a manner that is in accordance with recommendations from state-level authorities and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).</p>	<p>(sub)national debates. - Clarify the objective from the outset and inform citizens about it.</p> <p>See Formal evaluations table</p>

Initiative	Evaluation	Impacts	Lessons learned
Red Cross and Red Crescent approach to using community feedback to guide Covid-19 response in sub-Saharan Africa <sup>5</sup>	<p>No formal evaluation of stakeholders experiences.</p> <p>Qualitative research methods: IFRC reviewed and adapted the tools tested and used during the Ebola outbreak in the DRC for the COVID-19 pandemic. The tools included a simple form for recording comments shared during risk communication and community engagement activities, as well as a guide for conducting focus group discussions and a simple Microsoft Excel log sheet for entering and managing community feedback. They adapted the coding frame developed for the community feedback mechanism for the Ebola operation in the DRC for COVID-19 feedback data.</p>	<p>The most common topics emerging from the feedback forms were related to: mistrust in the response, preventive behaviours, nature and evolution of disease outbreak, existence of the disease, facts and features of the disease, appreciation or encouragement, transmission, who is affected, testing, response activities, lockdown, restriction of movement, closing borders, treatment of Covid-19, health care services, responders, fear or stigma, compliance or non-compliance, consequences of the outbreak, and vaccines. National societies used community insights to inform and adapt their responses.</p> <p>“The COVID-19 response showcased how simple ways to systematically listen to communities and respond to them can be integrated into an operation and harmonized across sub-Saharan Africa. It has also shown that specific actions can be taken to respond to community feedback at local and regional levels, and interagency coordination of community feedback can drive action.”<sup>5</sup>.</p>	<p>A major challenge was that no demographic information was recorded for people providing feedback comments. It would have been helpful to link specific comments to demographic groups.</p> <p>This feedback system showed how simple ways to systematically listen to communities and respond to them can be integrated into an operation and harmonized across sub-Saharan Africa. It has also shown that specific actions can be taken to respond to community feedback at local and regional levels, and interagency coordination of community feedback can drive action.</p>
Collaboration Between Faith-Based Communities and Public Health <sup>6</sup>	<p>This was a multicase observational study that used qualitative methods of data collection and analysis.</p>	<p>Establish a program named CoVivre. CoVivre is a financed project that works on addressing inequities experienced by marginalized groups in the context of the pandemic by acting as a catalyst for actions and partnerships with key actors. These experiences also led to the writing of a mediation guide in collaboration with public health authorities.</p>	<p>See Formal evaluations table</p>

Initiative	Evaluation	Impacts	Lessons learned
First Nations Community Panels <sup>7</sup>	<p>The study used community-based Participatory Action Research (PAR) methods to explore issues related to how First Nations Peoples experience and deal with Covid-19 and related policies and practice.</p> <p>The researchers explored using qualitative thematic analysis whether Community Panels are an acceptable and appropriate way of engaging First Nations Peoples in making decisions around infectious disease emergencies.</p>	<p>Engaging with First Nations Peoples in a culturally appropriate manner can lead to better collaboration. Two-way communication between non-First Nations Peoples and First Nations Peoples can inform public health policy.</p> <p>List of policy recommendations.</p>	See formal evaluations table
<b>INVOLVEMENT</b>			
<a href="#">Bristol Citizens' Assembly</a>	Formal evaluation not available. Assembly members completed eight questionnaires about their experience during the course of the assembly. <sup>45</sup>	<p>Most participants strongly agreed that "Processes like citizens' assemblies should be used more by Bristol City Council to inform their decision making." And that "Taking part in this citizens' assembly has made me want to be more involved in other aspects of decision making that affect my local area."</p> <p>The report stated that "The recommendations will be reviewed by the council's Cabinet, Corporate Leadership Board and the relevant services to look at legal, resourcing and other considerations. One City Thematic Boards will also review them. Upon completion of the initial review, we will share a response to each recommendation and information on what happens next. Bristol City Council and the City Office commit to providing an update on progress every six months. This will be available on the Bristol Citizens' Assembly webpages."</p> <p>However, the webpages can't be reached, the report cannot be found on the Bristol government website, and no further information can be found on the Involve website</p>	None reported



Initiative	Evaluation	Impacts	Lessons learned
<a href="#">Citizens' committee on vaccination against Covid-19</a>	Formal evaluation not available. A progress report on the work of the temporary vaccination commission published in March 2021 had several observations. <sup>46</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All external communication on the work of the Citizens' Collective should be deferred until the installation of the new mandate.</li> <li>- The new term of office will have to examine the interest of organizing a discussion with the researchers in charge of the evaluation in order to benefit from their first observations.</li> <li>- The recommendations of this working group will have to be analysed in the light of the work of the Citizens' Collective and the members of the collective will have to be informed of the choice that has been made whether to retain their proposals, and if not, of the reasons for which they are not retained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The method applied within the Temporary Committee has not been entirely satisfactory. Although it made it possible to adopt recommendations "as it happened", several members felt that the deadlines for amendments in committee did not allow the councillors present to consult their groups and represent the positions of the organized civil society, thus fulfilling the vocation of the Cese. These members also regretted that the adoption of the recommendations was part of a process derogating from the plenary vote provided for in the rules of procedure.</li> </ul>
<a href="#">Camden Health and Care Citizens' Assembly</a>	Formal evaluation not available. After each assembly event, we recorded participant feedback through evaluation forms and anecdotes. <sup>48</sup>	None reported	<p>The report included these tips for future citizen assemblies: <sup>48</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Be clear about purpose.</li> <li>- Let the journey shape the output. A citizens' assembly is a process. There should be a defined purpose and you should understand what a successful outcome would be from the start, but let the journey shape what the final product is.</li> <li>- Secure buy in from partners. Take time to really understand what partners and stakeholders want to get out of the assembly process.</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations left verbally by Assembly members included the effective dissemination of findings, and regular updates on progress following this citizens' assembly process, other suggestions included more regular citizens' assemblies to discuss issues facing the community.</p>
<b>COLLABORATION</b>			

Initiative	Evaluation	Impacts	Lessons learned
<a href="#">Extraordinary online session of the Citizens' Convention on Climate: Finding a way out of the Covid-19 crisis</a>	Multiple analyses of the French Citizens' Convention on Climate have been published (not specifically on the way out of the Covid-19 crisis). <sup>73-80</sup>	See Formal evaluations table.	See Formal evaluations table.
<a href="#">COVID-19 Culturally &amp; Linguistically Diverse Community Forums: South Australia</a>	The International Association for Public Participation published a case study. <sup>53</sup>	At the end of December 2020 as this case study was written, all the quick wins have been implemented, and the bulk of the longer-term actions were also being implemented. "The intel gained in this process successfully supported SA Health to avoid a second wave in the state." <sup>54</sup>	See Formal evaluations table.
Crowdsourcing communication for prevention strategies <sup>8</sup>	Facebook metrics were used to measure campaign reach. Engagement with individual ads was also assessed by the number of ThruPlays as a percentage of the number of users reached. Content analysis was conducted to identify features on individual videos; this involved coding based on visual observation of videos for presenter age category (child, youth, adult, older adult) and gender, video setting, activities, other features such as music or humour. Video language and postcode(s) distributed to were also recorded.	<p><b>Reach of the campaign videos</b></p> <p>The campaign videos reached 91,295 Facebook users in a population (aged 15+) of 167,277 in the NT plus part of WA. On the assumption that each Facebook user is an individual, this represents 55% of the population.</p> <p>Comments on videos indicated that individuals intended to share the video with children or young people in their classrooms or youth groups.</p> <p>"seeking unscripted COVID-19 prevention video messaging can support community ownership of pandemic messaging, rapid content generation, and a high level of Facebook user engagement".<sup>8</sup></p>	See Formal evaluations table

Initiative	Evaluation	Impacts	Lessons learned
Crowdsourcing Approaches to University Community Engagement and strategic planning during Covid-19 <sup>9</sup>	Qualitative study.	A list of potential Covid-19 prevention and control interventions to be implemented for students and faculty returning to university. Submitted campaigns covered interventions at the individual, community and institutional level. “The results of this study suggest that open calls are a promising approach to understanding university community members’ concerns and identifying stakeholder-driven, innovative solutions for safe university activity during the pandemic” <sup>9</sup>	See Formal evaluations table

Table 6. Formal evaluations

Initiative	Methods	Main findings	Certainty of the evidence
<b>CONSULTATION</b>			
<a href="#">Deliberative Consultation on Trade-offs Related to Using 'CovidSafe' Contact Tracing Technology</a> <sup>2</sup>	Transcripts were independently reviewed, coded, and then analysed thematically by two researchers, and cross-compared to track the emergence and course of different positions and arguments in group discussions, and to identify and clarify reasons why participants supported or rejected the presented options at the final poll.	Analysis of transcripts found that the key considerations underlying the participants judgements about the appropriateness of policy options focused on the extent to which the government relied on mandates versus voluntary use of the app, proportionality, fairness, and the trustworthiness of the app.  During each group’s deliberations, concerns about the effectiveness of the app were the launching pad and return point for most discussions and evaluations. The researchers’ impression was that participants were responding to sustained public scepticism about the usefulness of the technology. In the months following the release of the app, political and media discussion focused on the lack of evidence available to the public as to its effectiveness.	No effects were reported.

[Climate Assembly UK and the Covid-19 crisis](#)<sup>66 67</sup>

An evaluation commissioned by a mixed methods approach, including assembly member surveys and interviews, an expert witness survey, non-participant observation, content analysis of small group discussions, Parliament, government and CAUK Interviews and documentary analysis, population survey, and media analysis.<sup>67</sup>

A case study also used a mixed methods approach, combining surveys of the assembly members and witnesses, interviews with the assembly members, organisers, MPs, parliamentary staff, and government civil servants, and non-participant observation of the process.<sup>66</sup>

The evaluation found:

**Deliberation, facilitation, and decision-making**

- The deliberative quality of most of the discussions was very good: they were very focused on the topic, demands (although made infrequently by assembly members) were primarily justified with reasons that focused mainly on the common good.

The discussions were also very respectful, inclusive, and the assembly members were free to speak their opinions.

- The facilitation contributed to this deliberative quality.

- The decision-making process was fair and democratic with assembly members agreeing with the decisions made and the process for making them.

- More opportunities to co-ordinate recommendations should have been provided, especially across the topic groups.

**Impact on assembly members**

- Assembly members became more knowledgeable on the issues

- Assembly members' opinions evolved. Hearing from other assembly members and the expert panels were both influential in this opinion shift.

- Assembly members' confidence in their ability to engage in political participation increased.

- By the end, more assembly members indicated that they thought the UK political system works well and more indicated that they thought they had a say in what the UK Parliament does compared with the beginning.

**Impact on parliament and policy**

- Climate Assembly UK (CAUK) is seen to have been a success by the select committees and many of the recommendations are being actively engaged with. A number of committees have launched inquires referencing the CAUK's recommendations.

- Factors that compromised the influence of CAUK on the committees included: the length and breadth of the report, the turnover in committee membership due to the 2019 general election, the ambition of the CAUK remit, and an initial absence of a clear plan by the committees of how to deal with CAUK recommendations.

- Factors that compromised the influence of CAUK over government policy included: the division of CAUK assembly

Low to very low certainty evidence of impacts on assembly members, parliament and policy, the public and media.

Initiative	Methods	Main findings	Certainty of the evidence
		<p>members into separate thematic groups and the lack of public awareness of the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- As a form of democratic innovation, the common view within the Select Committees was that – although expensive – citizens' assemblies have an important contribution to make in supporting the policy process and Parliament should use this approach to public engagement more in the future.</li></ul> <p><b>Impact on the public and media</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- CAUK received more media coverage than any previous citizens' assembly in the UK and the coverage was largely positive. Despite this, public awareness of CAUK was very low throughout.</li><li>- When people are informed about the process, they trust it and see it as making a legitimate contribution to UK climate policy.</li><li>- The communications budget was insufficient for CAUK to make a real impact on the public, especially in a news context dominated by Brexit and the pandemic.</li></ul> <p>The case study of CAUK found that attempts to adapt the assembly's scope to the scale of the climate change issue compromised assembly member learning, the co-ordination of the resulting recommendations, assembly member endorsement of the recommendations, and the extent of their impact on parliament and government.</p>	

Initiative	Methods	Main findings	Certainty of the evidence
<a href="#">Oregon Citizens' Assembly on Covid-19 Recovery</a> <sup>56 68-70</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A case study compared survey data from the Citizen Assembly pilot with the prior Citizens' Initiative Reviews and provides analysis and recommendations that could improve the design and execution of future online assemblies.<sup>56</sup></li> <li>- A mixed case study explored how the government provided emergency information on the pandemic to the public, how the public provided input to the government, and how the government and the public worked together to respond to the pandemic.<sup>69</sup></li> <li>- A thematic analysis of transcripts examined how the internal dynamics of the mini-public were affected by the scaling-up process of connecting to larger policymaking domains.<sup>70</sup></li> <li>- A qualitative study that observed, took field notes, and recorded small group sessions explored how participants' storytelling activities accomplished deliberative play.<sup>68</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Though the Citizens' Assembly staff struggled to manage a complex agenda spread over seven weeks during a public health emergency, the panellists still managed to produce a sensible set of policy recommendations. Despite its limitations, the Assembly validated the basic idea that a mini-public design can adapt to an emergency, even one in which meeting together face-to-face would present too great of a public health risk. The panellists were directly involved in the immediate problem faced by their mini public. Despite their personal struggles with COVID-19, the panellists took their responsibility seriously and worked together respectfully, across real ideological differences, to come up with ways to help the most vulnerable Oregonians survive the pandemic. Contrary to the idea that only executives or expert advisors can offer timely advice during a crisis, the Assembly suggests that mini-publics can be gathered and convened quickly to provide timely advice to policymakers.<sup>56</sup></li> <li>- Citizens were overall satisfied with pandemic information provided by the state government, but they reported that they did not have sufficient opportunities to share their input with the government. Online mini-publics can serve as a meaningful and deliberative forum for civic participation during pandemics.<sup>69</sup></li> <li>- The Citizens' Assembly exhibited a shift toward a pragmatic orientation when considering the broader implications of their deliberations. In addition, as part of the pragmatic orientation, efficiency, scope, and efficacy dynamics became prominent when deliberators considered external political impacts and the role of the deliberations within the political system.<sup>70</sup></li> <li>- Storytelling activities accomplished aspects of deliberative play through introducing uncertainty, resisting premature closure, and promoting an "as if" frame that allowed groups to explore the scope and implications of proposals. Forum design influenced interaction and technology use and timing are key design features that can facilitate or inhibit deliberative play.<sup>68</sup></li> </ul>	<p>No effects were reported.</p>

Initiative	Methods	Main findings	Certainty of the evidence
<a href="#">Citizens' Assembly on restrictions and recommendations in response to the COVID-19 pandemic</a> <sup>42,43</sup>	One of key goals of deliberative mini-publics is to counteract expert domination in policymaking. Mini-publics can be expected to democratize expertise by providing citizens with good opportunities for weighing expert information. Yet, there are concerns about undue influence of experts within mini-publics. This non-randomised comparison tested these expectations by analysing data from an online mini-public to examine whether experts' field of specialization and the order of expert hearings had an impact on how participants' views developed.	Neither the field of expertise nor the order of hearings had systematic effects on participants' perceptions on containment measures. This suggests that interactive modes of expert hearings in mini-publics seem not to be prone to domination by experts.	Very low certainty evidence
Medical-Religious community engagement conference call series <sup>4</sup>	After the 5th community call, a survey was sent out to 200 community members who participated. All continuous variables were presented as mean (standard deviation, SD). Categorical variables were summarized as counts and percentages. Since the cohort of participants was not randomly selected, all statistics are deemed descriptive. Statistical analyses were conducted with R software (V.0.99.903).	Concerns identified by the community leaders as barriers to effective quarantining and adherence to precautions included food access, housing density, and access to screening and testing. Through the calls, ways to solve such challenges were addressed, with novel strategies and resources reaching the community. This medical-religious resource has proven feasible and valuable during the pandemic and warrants discussions on reproducing it for other communities during this and future infectious disease outbreaks.  Such information may help refine public health messaging and policies intended to mitigate the spread of the infection, reframing the value of medical-religious partnerships during epidemics or a pandemic.	No effects were reported.
Collaboration Between Faith-Based Communities and Public Health <sup>6</sup>	Qualitative study: Multi-case observational report. Thematic analysis of discussion notes.	Collaboration between faith-based communities and public health officials seems to counteract intercommunity tension and improve community's commitment to physical distancing measures (e.g., limiting or cancelling gatherings). There are some obstacles such as communication difficulties and decision-making limitations. However, this type of collaboration should be considered during pandemics for a more inclusion approach to public health.	No effects were reported.

Initiative	Methods	Main findings	Certainty of the evidence
First Nations Community Panels <sup>7</sup>	Qualitative study. Focus group discussions and thematic analysis used.	“All 40 participants from the 5 panels verbally indicated strong support of the Community Panels approach as an effective way of engaging First Nations Peoples in making decisions about pandemic planning and response strategies. The main theme of ‘respect’ centred on the overarching principle that First Nations Peoples are important in the context of continuation of culture and ongoing political resistance”. <sup>7</sup>	No effects were reported.



Initiative	Methods	Main findings	Certainty of the evidence
COLLABORATION			

[Extraordinary online session of the Citizens' Convention on Climate: Finding a way out of the Covid-19 crisis](#) <sup>73-80</sup>

- An analysis of the answers to questionnaires on the deliberative quality of the exchanges of participants in the Convention and their comparison with those given by participants in the regional citizens' conferences of the Great National Debate and the G1000 were used to explore dispositions in the interactions that make a deliberative situation a shared experience.<sup>73</sup>

- The idea that randomly selected citizens for a political task can be good enough representatives challenges the assumption that we need to choose the most competent among ourselves. And the fact that citizens' assemblies are sometimes tasked to draft legislation may undermine the authority of elected representatives. A case study drawing on parliamentary hearings and questions and public political reactions to the Convention tests this hypothesis of tension between competing forms of representation.<sup>74</sup>

- Social movements theory and document analysis methods were used to investigate the Convention's genealogy, policy proposals, and influence on decision-making, and to evaluate its potential for sustainability transformations.<sup>75</sup>

- A researcher at the French National Centre for Scientific Research who participated in the fact-checking group of scientists and observed the open sessions identified the most promising features and limitations of the Convention based on his experience.<sup>76</sup>

- Responses to surveys of participants in the Convention and the general public were compared to assess the representativity of the Convention, study the evolution of the participants' opinions, and document the perceptions of the Convention.<sup>77</sup>

- A group of scientists worked collaboratively with the goal of collecting and sharing observations during and after the Convention. Broadly speaking, their research interests fell into two distinct categories – the procedure and the substance – although they were also interested in how they intersected. They used different methods which, taken together, blended quantitative and qualitative approaches.<sup>78 79</sup>

- Whether successful deliberations (open, respectful, and constructive) presuppose participants' prior commitment to basic norms of deliberation, or produces the required qualities, remains an open research question. The communicational dimension of the deliberation engages the dispositions of the participants, such as trust in others, listening, mutual respect and reciprocity. These relational dispositions may appear as prerequisites for agreeing to deliberate. But these are potentialities which are actualized only in the deliberation itself. They can no doubt be related to behaviours linked to personal interest in the subject, to the social value attributed to collective discussion or to a collective exercise allowing comparison with others. The justification of individual positions in the face of a very diverse group of equals confronts the citizens drawn by lot with disagreements that they must overcome to build collective proposals. This situation of egalitarian communication is specific to deliberative exercises, and ultimately very uncommon in social and political life. The taste for disagreement of participants in the Convention appears to be a distinctive feature of "deliberative citizens" in relation to what is generally described as political behaviour. This provision was not monotonically related to the level of education.<sup>73</sup>

- It was the health crisis that forced citizens to take on the role of being representatives when the governance committee offered them to send the government some of their useful proposals for dealing with the Covid-19 pandemic. Because the measures had not yet been adopted by all the members, the discussions were particularly tense. It was no longer simply a question of communication presenting the Convention as "France in miniature", but of fully becoming a collective political actor. This touches on a central point of deliberative democracy: are those drawn by lot legitimate to speak, or even decide, in the name of the people? The Convention members were cautious about this, which led them to decide that it was preferable to transmit their proposals to the government and to Parliament, rather than directly to the referendum. Although the Convention members regularly expressed great confidence in their collective work and its ability to respond to its mandate in a

No effects were reported.

---

- Based on a description of the CCC and critical deduction, a legal research thesis explored the actual and potential impact of the CCC on French governance.<sup>80</sup>

spirit of social justice, they remained more withdrawn than the French when it comes to their political legitimacy.<sup>73</sup>

- Elected representatives may feel threatened in their legitimacy even when most randomly selected citizens do not see themselves as representatives. This may be because the Convention was seen by some as stepping on the prerogatives of the Parliament. This suggests that future citizens' conventions could benefit from a clearer functional division between the two forms of representation.<sup>74</sup>

- While the Convention produced an ambitious set of measures, only a small fraction was transposed into legislation after systematic unravelling by powerholders. "Whether similar citizens' assemblies can have transformative rather than system-reinforcing effects will largely depend on the degree of binding power they are endowed with, and the capacity of social movements to win significant concessions and leverage their positive social outcomes to build counter-hegemonic power."<sup>75</sup>

- Key strengths of the Convention were building an effective consensus across a wide field of application and disciplines and using a bottom-up approach starting with questions posed by non-experts. Limitations included time constraints, including not enough time for fact checking, the need for a broader range of experts to help with fact checking, the need for a more detailed and systematic analysis of the process and the proposed measures.<sup>76</sup>

- The Convention appeared broadly representative of the French population. Although, the participants seemed to have been somewhat more favourable to climate policies than the general population at the start, a majority support was found for all proposed measures but one. Despite the findings that the Convention correctly represented the population, there was widespread ignorance and mistrust towards the Convention, including a largely shared belief that it was not representative.<sup>77</sup>

- The approach taken by the Convention was characterized by (i) sustained interactions between citizens and the steering board; (ii) a significant input from technical and legal experts; (iii) and a strong emphasis on creating consensus, leaving little room for expressing dissent. This resulted in the citizens approving 149 measures, 146 of which President Macron

---

Initiative	Methods	Main findings	Certainty of the evidence
		<p>committed to follow up on. Yet, the promise that measures would pass “unfiltered” appeared increasingly questioned.<sup>78</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The steering bodies’ input, albeit significant, did not impair the citizens’ agency, creativity, and freedom of choice. While succeeding in creating consensus among the citizens who were involved, this co-constructive approach, however, failed to generate significant support among the broader public. “These results call for a strengthening of the commitment structure that determines how follow-up on the proposals from a citizens’ assembly should be conducted.”<sup>79</sup></li><li>- While the resulting project introduced by the French Government into the National Assembly resulted from the Convention’s proposals—as opposed to the State Council, which usually drafts the Government’s proposed bills—the Convention did not actually replace the ordinary legislative procedure, as some proponents of citizens’ assemblies would hope, but rather found its proposals thoroughly amended by it. The Convention’s actual normative impact was limited by its consultative constitutional nature, within the broader context of a French Constitution haunted by the spectral traces of its colonial origins and its historical tradition of supreme executive power. “However, the Convention nonetheless has the potential to impact the future of French governance, in particular due to the further institutionalisation of citizens’ conventions already in progress in the polity.”<sup>80</sup></li></ul>	

Initiative	Methods	Main findings	Certainty of the evidence
<a href="#">COVID-19 Culturally &amp; Linguistically Diverse Community Forums: South Australia</a> <sup>53</sup>	An International Association for Public Participation (iap <sup>2</sup> ) case study explored insights from the Forums to advance engagement practice.	<p>This project was unique and innovative for the following reasons: 1. Cross multicultural community conversation – breaking down silos between communities and enabling cross community supports to be established. 2. Community leaders with leaders of government – a slow unstructured conversation occurred helping to build relationships / trust and ensuring that the communities were heard by decision makers. In this sense the process removed the normal barriers of communication. 3. The process was conducted online, using a virtual room.</p> <p>The project had immediate and lasting impact on three outcomes: 1. It directly enabled the early control of the Thebarton cluster (outbreak) in August 2020 preventing a possible 'second wave'. The information gathered and framework developed from the engagement enabled SA Health to stage a quick and targeted response, contacting the Afghan community, providing clear information about minimising any spread of COVID19 and ultimately restricting the cluster to only 5 cases. 2. Culturally and linguistically diverse information reached over 500 leaders and influencers, and 20 support agencies partnered to engage with consumers. There were over 62,000 website visits to the multicultural COVID page. 3. In addition, the automated translation feature on the accessibility toolbar was used over 19,000 times. The translation tool had over 100 languages, including 35 text-to-speech voices.</p> <p>Three key engagement takeaways: 1. It is all about Relationships. The engagement process sought to build relationships between the top levels of government and cultural leaders. These relationships held SA Health in good stead as it sought to combat outbreaks. 2. You can build relationships online! 3. Engagement processes can lead to the unexpected (in very positive ways!) ... Whilst the process was convened to understand how government could communicate with and best support communities, unexpectedly the process also served to help communities identify ways that they could support each other.</p>	Very low

Initiative	Methods	Main findings	Certainty of the evidence
Crowdsourcing communication for prevention strategies <sup>8</sup>	Qualitative methods and analysis of Facebook plays and shares.	<p>These findings show that crowdsourcing can be an effective method for involving individuals in remote Aboriginal communities in public health communication. In particular, seeking unscripted COVID-19 prevention video messaging supported community ownership of pandemic messaging, and generated a high level of Facebook user engagement. The campaign also provides further evidence that community based non-profit organizations can play a valuable role in the translation of mainstream health communication through deep social networks in underserved communities</p> <p>That this high level of reach can be achieved at relatively a low cost of \$0.01 per engagement (view or reaction) suggests that post-code targeted Facebook advertising may be a useful distribution strategy for stand alone campaigns in low resource settings.</p> <p>Analysis of video content showed that overall, content involving multiple activities or a storyline generated more engagement than spoken word alone, or straightforward demonstration (like washing hands). Moreover, videos in outdoor or commercial (shops, banks etc.) settings generated more engagement than those in homes or with no obvious setting. Finally, the most popular videos involved children and/or young people participating in activities or demonstrations in a fun or funny way.</p>	No effects were reported.
Crowdsourcing Approaches to University Community Engagement and strategic planning during Covid-19 <sup>9</sup>	Qualitative study. Content analysis of submitted interventions.	Crowdsourcing methods can bring marginalised individuals and groups into participatory decision-making processes.	No effects were reported.

## References

1. KIELTY A, LEE A, NEBLO MA. Connecting to Congress During COVID-19: Political Representation and Two-Way Crisis Communication. *Digital Government: Research and Practice* 2022
2. Degeling C, Hall J, Johnson J, et al. Should digital contact tracing technologies be used to control Covid-19? Perspectives from an Australian public deliberation. *Health Care Anal* 2022;30(2):97-114. doi: 10.1007/s10728-021-00441-1 [published Online First: 20211026]
3. Topaz D. The wisdom of crowds, Part II: from conversation to policy, 2020.
4. Galiatsatos P, Monson K, Oluyinka M, et al. Community Calls: Lessons and Insights Gained from a Medical-Religious Community Engagement During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of religion and health* 2020;59(5):2256-62. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10943-020-01057-w>
5. Erlach E, Nichol B, Reader S, et al. Using Community Feedback to Guide the COVID-19 Response in Sub-Saharan Africa: Red Cross and Red Crescent Approach and Lessons Learned from Ebola. *Health security* 2021;19(1):13-20. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1089/hs.2020.0195>
6. El-Majzoub S, Narasiah L, Adrien A, et al. Negotiating Safety and Wellbeing: The Collaboration Between Faith-Based Communities and Public Health During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of religion and health* 2021;60(6):4564-78. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10943-021-01434-z>
7. Crooks K, Taylor K, Law C, et al. Engage, understand, listen and act: evaluation of Community Panels to privilege First Nations voices in pandemic planning and response in Australia. *BMJ glob* 2022;7(8):08. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2022-009114
8. Glennie M, Dowden M, Grose M, et al. Engaging Remote Aboriginal Communities in COVID-19 Public Health Messaging via Crowdsourcing. *Frontiers in public health* 2022;10:866134. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.866134>
9. Day S, Li C, Hlatshwako TG, et al. Assessment of a Crowdsourcing Open Call for Approaches to University Community Engagement and Strategic Planning During COVID-19. *JAMA network open* 2021;4(5):e2110090. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.10090>
10. Scottish Government. Coronavirus (COVID-19): framework for decision making - overview of public engagement, 2020.
11. Renwick A. Considering evidence, 2020.
12. Climate Assembly UK. Interim briefing - Covid-19, recovery and the path to net zero, 2020.
13. Stark C. Committee on Climate Change: Coronavirus and Net Zero, 2020.
14. Climate Assembly UK. The Path to Net Zero: Executive Summary, 2020.
15. Ada Lovelace Institute. Deliberating rapidly and online about COVID-19 technologies, 2020.
16. Ada Lovelace Institute. Confidence in a crisis? Building public trust in a contact tracing app, 2020.
17. Britainthinks. WMRCG Citizens' Panel: Headline findings from quantitative survey, 2020.
18. Britainthinks. West Midlands Recovery Coordination Group: Citizens' Panel full debrief of findings, 2020.
19. Healthy Democracy and Oregon's Kitchen Table. Oregon Citizens' Assembly on Covid-19 Recovery, Final report, 2020.
20. Ipsos Mori & Imperial College Health Partners. London COVID-19 deliberation. Report – insights and expectations from a deliberation with Londoners, 2020.
21. Castell S, Clemence M, Kamvar R. Covid-19 winter preparedness: An online dialogue project for the Academy of Medical Sciences. London: Ipsos MORI, 2020.
22. Sciences AoM. Preparing for a challenging winter 2020/21. London: Academy of Medical Sciences, 2020.

23. Missions Publiques. The Nantes Métropole citizens' convention. Paris, France: Missions Publiques, 2021.
24. Nantes Metropole. Citizen dialogue in times of health crisis. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2020.
25. Nantes Metropole. Covid-19: The Nantes citizens' convention launches its work. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2020.
26. Nantes Metropole. The Citizens' Convention hears 35 experts from the territory. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2020.
27. Nantes Metropole. Third session for the Citizens' Convention of Nantes. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2021.
28. Nantes Metropole. The Citizens' Convention asks for your opinion! Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2020.
29. Nantes Metropole. The inhabitants respond to the Citizens' Convention of Nantes. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2020.
30. Nantes Metropole. Report of astonishment of the guarantors. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2021.
31. Nantes Metropole. The gazette of the agreement: A look back at the third session of the Citizens' Convention of Nantes. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2021.
32. Nantes Metropole. Nantes Citizens' Convention: citizens give their opinion. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2021.
33. Nantes Metropole. Mirror group on crisis management. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2020.
34. Nantes Metropole. Covid-19: Experiences of crisis & aspirations for tomorrow. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2021.
35. Nantes Metropole. Post-Covid Citizens' Convention: Nantes Métropole and its municipalities hard at work. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2021.
36. Nantes Metropole. "The strong mobilization of services within very short deadlines should allow a response commensurate with the challenges". Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2021.
37. Nantes Metropole. Citizens' convention: "This citizen's opinion must become a little guide from which we will regularly draw". Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2021.
38. Nantes Metropole. "The citizens of the convention invite us to get to work collectively and to be facilitators.". Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2021.
39. Nantes Metropole. Nantes Citizens' Convention: elected officials commit. Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2021.
40. Nantes Metropole. Citizens' Convention: what results one year later? Nantes, France: Nantes Metropole, 2022.
41. Scottish Parliament. Scottish Parliament Citizens' Panel on COVID-19. Edinburgh: Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body, 2021.
42. Kulha K, Leino M, Setälä M, et al. A weighty public deliberation on the acceptability of corona measures. Final report of the citizens' deliberation. Turku, Finland: University of Turku, PALO research project, 2021.
43. Leino M, Kulha K, Setälä M, et al. Expert hearings in mini-publics: How does the field of expertise influence deliberation and its outcomes? *Policy Sci* 2022;55(3):429-50. doi: 10.1007/s11077-022-09465-3 [published Online First: 20220806]
44. Conference on the Future of Europe. Report on the Final Outcome. Brussels: European Union, 2022.
45. Involve. How do we recover from COVID-19 and create a better future for all in Bristol? Report from Bristol's Citizens' Assembly. Bristol: Bristol City Council, 2021.
46. Goujon S, Lafont P, Pajares Y Sanchez C. Vaccination COVID-19 Progress report. Paris: Conseil Économique, Social et Environnemental – CESE, 2021.
47. Citizens' committee on vaccination against Covid-19. Citizens' committee on the vaccination campaign against COVID-19 – Project sheets. Paris: Conseil Économique, Social et Environnemental – CESE, 2021.
48. Kaleidoscope Health and Care. Camden Health and Care Citizens' Assembly Final Report. Camden: Camden's Health and Wellbeing Board, 2020.



49. Citizens' Convention on the Climate. Contribution of the Citizens' Convention on Climate for a way out of the crisis. Paris: Conseil Économique, Social et Environnemental – CESE, 2020.
50. Citizens' Convention on the Climate. Contribution of the Citizens' Convention on Climate for a way out of the crisis - press release. Paris: Conseil Économique, Social et Environnemental – CESE, 2020.
51. Citizens' Convention on the Climate. Official website of the Citizens' Convention on the Climate 2023 [Available from: <https://www.conventioncitoyennepourleclimat.fr/>].
52. Citizens' Convention on the Climate. Proposals of the Citizens' Climate Convention. Paris: Conseil Économique, Social et Environnemental – CESE, 2021.
53. Jenke E, Fletcher E. Case Study 1: DemocracyCo & SA Health: Multicultural communities stopping a pandemic in its tracks! *iap2 Case Studies Series 2021* 2021
54. DemocracyCo. Covid-19 Online Multicultural Forums, South Australia 2023 [Available from: <https://www.democracyco.com.au/our-projects/covid19-cald-forums/>].
55. Traverse, Ada Lovelace Institute, Bang the Table, et al. Leaving Lockdown Public Debate: Rapid, online deliberation on COVID-19 technologies. Exploring issues of privacy, trust, community, and human rights. London: Traverse, 2020.
56. Gastil J, Anderson C, Black L, et al. Convening a minipublic during a pandemic: A case study of the Oregon Citizens' Assembly Pilot on COVID-19 Recovery. *Digital Government: Research and Practice* 2022;3(2):1-19.
57. Nantes Metropole. The citizens' opinion from the Nantes Métropole Citizens' Convention, 2020.
58. Kantar Public. Multilingual Digital Platform of the Conference on the Future of Europe: Final Report, 2022.
59. Citizens' Committee on Vaccination against Covid-19. Vaccination Covid-19: Compilation of recommendations: Missions Publiques, 2021.
60. McKeon A. #LockDownDebate: Lessons for rapid online deliberation. London: Traverse, 2020.
61. McKeon A, Patel R, Burall S, et al. The principles of good deliberative practice. London: Ada Lovelace Institute, 2020.
62. Citizens' Convention on the Climate. How will the participants work during the Convention? Paris: Conseil Économique, Social et Environnemental – CESE, 2019.
63. Citizens' Convention on the Climate. Fact checkers. Paris: Conseil Économique, Social et Environnemental – CESE, 2019.
64. Congressional Management Foundation. Online Town Halls for the COVID 19 Crisis: Proven Methods to Connect, Learn, and Lead, 2020.
65. Topaz D. The wisdom of crowds, Part I: from conversation to policy, 2020.
66. Elstub S, Carrick J, Farrell DM, et al. The scope of climate assemblies: lessons from the climate assembly UK. *Sustainability* 2021;13(20):11272.
67. Elstub S, Farrell DM, Carrick J, et al. Evaluation of climate assembly UK. Newcastle: Newcastle University, 2021.
68. Black LW, Wolfe AW, Han S-H. Storytelling and Deliberative Play in the Oregon Citizens' Assembly Online Pilot on COVID-19 Recovery. *American Behavioral Scientist* 2022:00027642221093591.
69. Park CH, Richards RC, Reedy J. Assessing emergency information sharing between the government and the public during the COVID-19 pandemic: An open government perspective. *Public Performance & Management Review* 2022;45(4):828-59.
70. Rountree J, Anderson C, Reedy J, et al. The internal dynamics of “scaling up” deliberative mini-publics. *Communication and the Public* 2022;7(3):146-64.

71. High-Level Advisory Group. Conference on the Future of Europe: What worked, what now, what next? Europe: Conference on the Future of Europe Observatory, 2022.
72. von Ondarza N, Ålander M. After the Conference on the Future of Europe: Time to Make Reforms Happen. *Four lessons for a European Union again requiring a new balance between deepening and widening, SWP comment* 2022(49)
73. Apouey B, Fourniau J-M, Tournus S. Deliberative Citizens: Evidence from the French Citizens' Convention for Climate. *Participations-Revue de sciences sociales sur la démocratie et la citoyenneté* 2022;2022(3)
74. Buge E, Vandamme P-É. Conflicts of Legitimacies in Representative Institutions: The Case of the French Citizen Convention for Climate. *Representation* 2022:1-18.
75. Denz R. "End of the world, end of the month, same struggle": On depoliticized transitions and emancipatory sustainability transformations-A case study of The French Citizens' Convention on Climate. *Master Thesis Series in Environmental Studies and Sustainability Science* 2021
76. Eymard L. From the French Citizens' Convention on Climate to the Conference on the Future of Europe: A participatory science and democracy perspective. *European Law Journal* 2020;26(1-2):136-40.
77. Fabre A, Apouey B, Douenne T, et al. Who are the Citizens of the French Convention for Climate? 2021
78. Giraudet L-G, Apouey B, Arab H, et al. Deliberating on Climate Action: Insights from the French Citizens' Convention for Climate. *Hal-03119539* 2021
79. Giraudet L-G, Apouey B, Arab H, et al. "Co-construction" in deliberative democracy: lessons from the French Citizens' Convention for Climate. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 2022;9(1):1-16.
80. Rozenberg D. The Citizens' Convention for Climate in France: An Introduction of Participatory Democracy into French Governance. University of Kent (United Kingdom), 2021.