Raw H-diagrams and action plans from the PATH conference

"How effectively are the public involved in policy development?"

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P1AC
- policy made prior to public participation - it is used as a legislation exercise - involvement is confused with consultancy - much public involvement is just lip service - it is often about opinions not organisations - function specific participation difficult - problem of resources time money - counter productive institutional structures - There should be thought more on the consequences of doing participations - Usual stakeholders do not take public opinions seriously - Political will deficit - The public is often the section of society best able to articulate views. - Many people ignored - Results are ignored - I don't know almost any example in my country - Results are not acted upon - It doesn't have real implications - People's input not reacted upon	Scores: 1 → 1 2 → 2 3 → 3 3 → 3 3/4 → 3/4 4 → 4 **Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:** Commitment of government to act on results — 2 Proactive education in learning from past experiences and outcomes in order to implement a more effective future approach! — 1 Use primary and secondary education to teach people how to be deliberative, open and willing to revise their views — 6 Move towards participatory culture Institutionalise participatory approaches in governmental organisations -> organisational change — 4 Fight for your right to participate creative self-organisation — 6	- results show lay-people can discuss difficult issues - public knowledge →new ideas that are otherwise not present - systematic procedures - willingness of participants - participation is experienced as positive by participants - effort is being made to improve them - clear examples of substantive contributions to knowledge production - people still asked for opinion whether or not accepted - there is at least something going on (the subject's not silent/ taboo) - more public involvement processes are being carried out - there is a lot of work but it can be better - I have some expectations on future improvements - Occasionally, v.v.v. occasionally people do have an impact on policy - General positive representation image part - Public involvement is increasingly been recognised as a useful step in its own right

Comment Card: None

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P2AC
- we do want to participate but are lacking of means - people do not believe that their views are taken into account - administrations have to deal with many (not coordinated) tasks. They neglect participation due to time constraints - decision power is moving towards economic interest of a few - because public opinion is frequently misrepresented - because public involvement is used as a political tool	Scores: 1 → 1 2 → 2 3 → 3 3 → 3 3 → 3 3 → 3	- some issues are genuinely public - channels do exist both informal and formal - policy sometimes cares - public entrepreneurs - basic democratic structure -> elections - deliberative innovation beginning to happen and citizens show they can deliberate - representation of public by NGOs, interest groups which are full of election – working - government feel need to legitimate their activities - because of minority influence - because policy makers need to be (voted) elected - because there are people that attempt to involve

Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:

Action	
Improving the transparency of the policy process	6
Less workload so people can be more active citizens	1
Improving the rules for politicians obliging them to care more about public will	1
Better media coverage that doesn't trivialize issues	4
Improve education/ measures that bring social learning	3

- because vested interests still influence the policy making process and that is reflected in the results - public opinion is not considered - governments influenced more by powerful interests than by public - public don't have visible ways - public delegates on policy makers - elections a poor means of influence – money, spin - discourse of globalization -> responsiveness to markets - policy makers have own interests (to stay in power) and not just representatives - not enough political will for their efficacy - often conflicting perspectives among different stakeholders - certain groups are not involved – kids, -…	Avoiding the vicious circle lack of participation – participation exercise - lack of effective response -> affected expectations -> lack of participation	3	other people - because the public is interested - because I can not be totally negative (my score was 1) - there is a certain degree of public involvement (e.g. voting systems, decentralised actions) but this involvement is often more pretended than practiced - administrations do notice that participation makes their task easier - participation is fashionable! It is included in the discourse and developed up to a point - regulations on participatory activities in big planning projects

Comment Card:

Policy development where?

Should policies be involved in every issue? This hasn't been discussed.

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P3OTH

- some publics have very little voice/ effect - policy makers often don't implement recommendations from public involvement - no examples of full involvement - some consultation/ participation are "insultations" - not intended not engaged – not genuine - abuse of public participation - we are so far…. - Not ideal models for a "10" - There is always room to grow - Some people don't want to be involved - Pessimism? - So much talk, so poor results… - Rhetoric - If it was effectively integrated in policy development, we would not be here… - Participation is not a regular part of policy development - Some policies may not be appropriate for a "10" involvement - Lack of political willingness - A lot of things to learn: process management; political impact "10" is relative - participation fatigue - because of manipulation	Scores: 1 → 1
	      3/9 → 3/9
	      3 → 3
	      3/8 → 3/8
	      3 → 3
		- I thought of a specific context - Political voting is a firm of involvement - Answer is context dependent: a) experience of some public development in Scotland (Access); b) developing rhetoric and practice is positive; c) actual experience of consultation through involvement - Not a unitary answer for all policies or publics - Some publics do participate in their own way in some policy developments to some extent - Because things are moving - Because I am optimistic - Public participation comes in many forms - Public protest unorganised by governments or others is a form of involvement - Some work is being done in the area - Because there are examples where public involvement does make a difference - My ideal reference would have scored higher - Things can only improve - If I say "0" it means I'm failing! - Things are getting worked out - Because because because because because of the wonderful things he does

Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:

Policy makers are converts	6
Much better understanding of process (research findings)	5
Focus on transparency of policy process	6
Educate the public so that they demand participation (maybe)	2
More awareness for trade off situations (restricted resources)	2

Comment Card: None

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons	Code P4AC
- often participation but often goals are not clear - high rate cost effectiveness - it is not 0 because it is effectively use to legitimate predetermined results - public does not exist for policy only interested publics - often participation but choice for method rather random - participation manage conflict but also creates conflict - political structure discourages deliberative participation - organized interests prefer restricted access - systematic failures in mass education are common - low turnout for elections	Scores: 2 → 4 3 → 3 3 → 3 4 → 4 5 → 5 5 → 7	- academic and policy makers learning to hear - development of innovative methods as alternative to e.g. public hearings - new laws, directives, etc. have been created. (we are on the way, intention) - even in a limited way is a way to open up discussion - political system is porous - many countries are democracies - politics needs a minimum of effectiveness to be chosen again - all behaviours are local - more public participation than e.g. 10 years ago - free medias contribute to discussion letters to the editor, etc. - elections are an important part of participation	

Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:

Take an ecosystem approach to environmental management	3
Create multiple participatory opportunities to increase the public's experience of participation	3
To make a better link between goal of participatory process and methods to use in this process	2
A better definition of effectiveness of participation	2
Make from differences an opportunity to learn -> from consensus focus to compromises	4
Get experience with Internet and new information society tools -> cyber participation	4

Comment Card: None

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P5AC

- stressed working lives make people withdraw from discussions any bodies
- because the more inclusionary the PP the less can decision makers (often) understand and use it
- election processes are a weak way to engage in policy development
- policy makers unconcerned about general public
- access is driven by money
- because decision makers' time frames are hard to meet
- far too few opportunities to engage in deliberative processes – specifically weak
	Scores: 4 → 4
	   2 → 2
	   3 → 3
	   3 → 3
	   3 → 3
		- because policy makers refer to some of the outcomes
		- elite authority is being unsettled slightly
		- there is input at times
		- because PP does happen and there is money for it
		- media, especially newspapers function as a way to voice concerns
		- through election processes people get involved
		- public have access through elected officials
		- the notion of "the public" as a unified entity is being unsettled
		- public has various opportunities for voice at various stages of policy process
		- because administrations change (sometimes)

Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:

Action	
Define and enact what is effective PP and place it into law	2
Increase incentives for voting	1
Increase public participation incentives (e.g. education, adequate funding and other resources; codification to make transparent what will be done with public input	7
Eliminate barriers in public regulation and create incentives for public participation	5

integrated in regulation - public input is pre-textual, not actual - new regulatory regimes are forming - agenda-setting power typically remains centralised - organised publics are not being heard in these processes - because many exercises of PP remain self-referential - organised interests are often narrow and engage more in negotiations than deliberations - little acceptance of "alternative" R&D agendas - difficult to argue against "necessity" of economic growth	(how do we get 7 votes if there are only 5 participants????) VK	- some transparency in decision making - relatively good access to politicians - fair knowledge in general - possibilities for new forms of social agency are opening up - people get to inform politicians through organisations existing on specific issues

Comment Card: None

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons CodeP6AC
- participation is often difficult to achieve - most of the time the distribution of results is poor - lack of knowledge of how to involve effectively - democracy is boring - to much information – glut - why not 10? – info glut! Info distortion; democracy becomes boring!; people don't know how to make use of it - often used to legitimise - not at the start of the process involved (link to legitimisation) - interpretation of involvement is sometimes worrying - the results doesn't get a hearing (policy has other reasons for decisions) (apple and peaks) - under represented groups not involved - who is "the public" - many sectors of public do not vote - many experience social and economic exclusion - dominance of economic interests - influence of business power groups - jargon – too much. Not clear! - Many important issues do not get addressed by policy makers - Topics absent from the policy agenda	Scores: 3 → 3 3 → 3 4 → 4 4 → 4 3/4 → 3/4 6 → 6	- Elite power groups are heard - Non-academics work better? - It depends on the group - Role of NGOs - Locally it probably works better? - Why not 0? Widespread public info; "functioning democracy; "efficient" local levels - Role of media - Information - Local levels of engagement work - Democracy functions - Try to influence important decisions (not all) - Zero would mean no participation - There is a striving towards open dialogues with citizens (not only educational) - We are not a Fascist state - Adaptability – change can happen - Some results of participatory approaches end up in policy making - Topics do get on the political agenda sometimes - Some people vote - Opportunities – certain opportunities that need to be taken advantage of…. - Some "good" examples – "local" problems which have engaged

Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:

Policy should be more open/ aware	3
More referenda	1
Be more open (explicit) and honest about the objective of your participatory process	4
Basic education on how to use citizen rights/ local democracy instruments	4
Involve everyone – target those who are under-represented	1
Develop explicit processes that require participation at "upstream" stages of decision making	5

Comment Card: Suggestions: questions altogether too broad – so many points could be made.

Not enough linkages for becoming more precise.

Suggested action: develop explicit processes that require participation at "upstream" stages of decision making (target those who are under represented).

Why is it important?: because we must enable a basic education on how to use citizen rights/ local democracy instruments in order to make policy more open, honest, explicit and aware, e.g. referenda.

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P7AC

- there are no massive actions (protests, strikes)
- results of the research we did for my country were quite disappointing
- the neo-liberal policy framework has scope for influence only within its assumptions, except where significant opposition undermines those assumptions, or where local issues have low stakes
- there is an authoritative approach i.e. to get the public to accept decisions that have been taken already
- no referenda in Germany/EU/ Leipzig/ Saxony
- distrust by scientists/ politicians in general public
- no participation for public budgets and
	Scores: 2 → 1
	          2 → 2
	          5 → 3
	          3 → 3
	          6 → 5
	          4 → 4
		- I did research on public participation in the field of biodiversity monitoring and some results were good
		- There are some things that seem to be moving on after all (just an opinion)
		- UK government has a well developed consultation process doe policy development
		- My experience working with policy people in DEFRA has shown that they are interested in/ attempting to go beyond consultation within their constraints
		- Participation in policy
		- Is expected
		- Policy makers have started thinking about the benefits of PP
		- Some workshops, etc. have been organised and the number of those is increasing
		- Existing practice example

Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:

Action	
Mobilization of people (especially young people) by mobile technology to activate "scattered crowds"	3
Find mechanisms how to take into account the fears of the powerful to open up to deliberation and participation	4
Establishing consensus conferences/ "future workshops" on city level every 5 years (or so)	2
Convince decision makers – scientists that PP has a lot to offer. Get rid of authorisation approach	2
Challenge the dominant policy through high profile (publicised) argument and protest	4

other "initial" issues - consultation is still pretty top-down in the UK, does not actively facilitate engagement with marginalised groups in many cases, and could be more transparent - often information instead of participation (but labelled participation) - results often not respected (also negative for information) - not systematically done, but single experiments - people are not familiar with getting involved and it is difficult to convince them that their opinion will be taken into account		- Why not zero? Parts of the public organise themselves into pressure groups which can block some policies; parts of the public sometimes disrupt government policies - More room for deliberative processes than used by the public - At least a lot of discourse on it (conscience)

Comment Card: None

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P8AC

- where will the money come from? Lots is needed to do this properly
- only a very limited number and types of "publics" usually participate
- public input avenues are not influential and usually ignored
- some government agencies conduct pro-forma participatory processes and don't use the results
- no one has ever consulted me
- we wouldn't be having this conference if we were at "10"
- policy development is highly political and constrained, excluding the public
- the solutions developed in participatory processes are changed by subsequent political processes
- ineffectiveness, delusion, deception
- the government probably just want to "capture " public opinion
- the links between process and policy are subject to negotiation and power
- a way to force the public to accept decisions
- don't seem to make it to policy
- cooptation
- there is little confidence/ belief in the value of public input
	Scores: 1 → 2
	     2 → 2
	     1 → 1
	     3 → 3
	     3 → 3
		- things seem to be done better in some other countries (i.e. not UK)
		- I've heard of different consultative processes
		- There are occasional public forums to inform policy
		- Zero is never the right answer. There is always something
		- A small start has been made
		- There are opportunities for public input in various policy processes
		- There have been instances where public involvement improved decisions
		- The farmers I study are getting tired of being consulted
		- There are some policy people who are receptive to public input
		- Prospects for the future are there… but there's plenty of cynicism
		- At least some US government agencies have made significant commitments to participation
		- There is the necessity of involving the public so there are several methods that, in principle, work reasonably well
		- Policy makers need to have a "public opinion" input at least for instrumental reasons
		- At least some US corporations view public opinion as a major factor constraining their operations

Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:

Action	
Combine participatory methods with more informal and more flexible activities (such as community based research)	3
Publicise and emphasise the links between public consultation and resulting policy	4
Involve policy makers in the participatory processes	3
Engage corporate, private actors to a greater extent in participatory processes	2
Encourage decision making agencies to share more decision authority with participants	3

Comment Card: None

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P9AC

- no one with power is interested in incorporating public knowledge and views
- vested interests prevent public's views from being taken into account
- policy decisions tend to be made before (or regardless of) consultation with public
- it's a poorly organised representative democracy
- the UK veers forward and technology
- too many issues of "how to" unresolved
- the nature of reality prevents ideal processes all the time
- the electoral system does not encourage public values being expressed
- what is effective involvement? To my standards this rarely happens. Power makes some persons / stakeholders more effective
- most policy development doesn't involve "public" (why not?) – maybe some stakeholders
- unclear what is the actual empirical and theoretical performance
- there are no effective, accepted institutionalised processes for incorporating public knowledge and views
- governments have pre-committments especially in re econ. Growth and competitive goals, that make out attending to the problem
	Scores: 7 → 7
	      2 → 2
	      2 → 2
	      3 → 3
	      3 → 3
	      4 → 4
	
	Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:
	
	| Be aware of the public's expectations
		4

Policy makers should have to describe in detail the factors that led to the decision being made (transparency/ accountability)	5
Greater resources devoted to genuine public engagement at all stages in policy making	1
Fund comparative research on public participation in policy making	5
Power potential and grounds on participation must always be explicit	3		- normative reasons - enriching representation with deliberative elements - it is representative of democracy - plenty of opportunities for those who ant to make a noise - people vote - people are consulted to some extent in policy making - there are various pressure/ interest groups influencing government - policy makers sometimes are free to utilise information supplied by the public - success can be observed - even bad participation has its effects - I was personally involved in positive examples of public involvement in policy - I think it worked out reasonably well - Politics sometimes influence policy – making by fueling public controversies (i.e. indirectly) - Politicians have to get elected, so cannot always ignore public's views

Comment Card: None

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons CodeP10AC
- PP does not happen early enough in policy making process - Feedback to participants often does not occur - Not always clear how results of PP are integrated into policy decisions - Because public involvement so often does not make a difference - Because involvement of the public so easily becomes a tick box exercise - Because there are not the spaces to allow public involvement to be effective - Because economic imperatives (global competition, etc.) frown out competing values and concerns - Politicians do not want on all cases to involve the public - Lack of public visibility of the relevant issues - Because technoscience is constituted in a way that tends to exclude every day life - In Spain there are very few real participatory experiences that really have an effect on policy making	Scores: 1 → 1 　　　　2 → 2 　　　　3 → 3 　　　　3 → 3 　　　　3 → 3 　　　　4 → 4 　　　　6 → 6 **Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future**: | More evidence of early involvement	4
Introduce "citizen initiatives" like Switzerland into other countries	3
Clearer move towards shared responsibility in decision making between policy makers and stakeholders	3
More research (and better) into design and evaluation of process	1
More funds for participatory processes from state	4
Demonstration that past PP has affected decisions	2
Instil greater sense of social responsibility amongst public	1		- public participation exercises are held - some legislation (E.g. S.E.A) has public consultation as a requirement - PP is increasingly discussed - Because there is some effective involvement - Because compared to 20 years ago there is much more public involvement than there was - Because there is at least a recognition across many areas of policy development that public should be involved - The process of deliberation can in certain cases be quite thorough - Involvement of affected parties - Federalism (local autonomy) - Because public mobilise and force policy makers to take account of their views - There are some few positive experiences (in Spain), so I couldn't say "zero" and we could also day representative democracy is a way of participation - Because neo-liberal states try to "enrol" publics in governance – they know they can't govern alone any more - Popular referenda

- "new" instruments should be applied more often - participation experiences in Spain are used mainly as "marketing" for local authorities but not for policy making - potential in transparencies - Due to legally bindingness of public participation - Strong differences in actual policy implementation (lack in cultural control) - Hardly shared responsibility but rather a shift of work on stakeholders		- Awareness of the importance of PP raises the knowledge elicitation - Broad deliberation process - Experiences are given (mainly between specific groups)

Comment Card: None

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P11AC

- Policy makers apply their own filters to what experts and the public say
- Decision making processes cannot always take into consideration views of "public voice"
- Government decision makers do not appear to listen I know
- Evidence that participation outcomes make little difference
- Marginalized groups feel alienated by process
- "participation is under theorcised -> poor praxis
- there is no direct engagement between policy (formulation) actors and public
- only few people participate in democratic procedures and mechanisms for that are weak
- few persons involved limited access to
	Scores: 2 → 2
	          2 → 2
	          3 → 3
	          3 → 3
	          3 → 3
	          3 → 3
		- in a representative democracy the public at least can vote for policy makers
		- sometimes surprising effects of policy ?? open windows of opportunity for participation
		- the media may, at times, act as a conveyor of public views
		- some researchers seek to identify and discriminate view of specific groups within "public"
		- public represented through local and regional governance structures which may represent public views
		- focus groups for policy formulation on increase
		- increasing number of channels for participation
		- optimism that participation will be furthered e.g. nuclear power for UK debate
		- some participation initiatives have contributed to policy development e.g. BNFL waste
		- slowly changing discourse
		- participation is becoming more encouraged e.g.

Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:	
Improve timing of feedback mechanisms and integrate into decision making timetable	7
Increase transparency of decision making (give arguments for decisions)	3
OST should only fund programmes where policy actors are involved	1
Need clear mechanisms for incorporating public, experts and policy makers	4
Need significant recruitment of heterodox economists into all treasuries	2
Improving access to information for public	0

relevant knowledge and decision opportunities - active exclusion by relevant decision takers - participation still "determined" and "managed" from the top-down: still a reactionary response - need to move from "participation" to social learning i.e. necessary not sufficient - access to participatory processes not encouraged - time pressure for decisions to be taken counted interest in the public for specialised questions alienation promoted by experiences as well as by media framing - poor mechanisms for integrating social/ public views with sci/ icon arguments in decision making - no clear government or institutional mechanisms to take outcomes on board e.g. GM Nation - Institutional arrangements are not conducive	Developing stronger consultative procedures	4	GM Nation - rich experience from "developing" country contents - there are mechanisms for involving the public (public hearings, etc.) - politicians do read "letters to the editor" and the like - Aahuas convention - Public's view sometimes accurately voiced by media (admittedly often exaggerated, ??) but media plays a role in debating issues

Comment Card: Who are "public"? Different in different countries. E.g. Dryzek model

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons CodeP12PRACT
- Re deliberative democracy – voting is compulsory but issues tend not to be around science or technology (nuclear excepted) - Lack of effective communication channels to engage the public in a meaningful way - We (OZ) have a traditionally strong split between scientists and non-scientist expertise - Public involvement is too often hijacked by interest groups - Final decisions have not taken into account the public's views - Participatory processes have not accounted for different cultural backgrounds - There are too many polls and too little deliberation processes - A failure of imagination on the part of decision makers re the possibilities and benefits - Its all been lip service	Scores: 3/4 → 3 　　　4 → 2/3 　　　4 → 4 　　　5 → 5 　　　6 → 6 　　　3 → 3 **Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future**: Communication/ marketing campaigns from professionals to politicians/ policy makers re the benefits of involving the public Involve industry as well as government Legislate an independent body incorporating industry, researchers, community groups to oversee compulsory participatory processes for major new policy initiatives Introduce a process that obligates politicians to organise and listen to deliberative democracy processes when making new laws Get an influential and popular celebrity to campaign and moderate these processes. The "D factor" (democracy and deliberation)	- some governments have legislated citizen voices as part of the way business is done - there are100s, maybe 1000s of dedicated researchers and practitioners dedicated to making this happen - I believe in increased public involvement - I work hard to increase public involvement - I have seen the impact of public involvement increase - I'm not dully aware of the types of all the public participation processes in OZ - Some efforts have been made - In some cases there has been success - Some government people are ultimately concerned about PP - Because the politicians are paying at least lip services - Because some consultations are doing a good work - Genuine attempts - Government still persists with trying to encourage

- Current government doesn't pay too much attention to public in policy development - The politicians pay lip services - There is no listening to the citizens if it does not fit into the political agenda - Resistance to change and bureaucratic inertia - Vested interests don't want the public involved - The same reasons as the "positive" reasons - Government not particularly interested in PPs - Commercial imperatives of new technologies too often treat the public as "customers" not a participatory public - ??? ?? of advertising for ???missions are taken as the way to undertake PP ex - discussion papers are ?????? not for the public	Legislate a quasi-governmental structure that sponsors in bi-annual national deliberation on the most important public policy issue and the outcomes go directly to a floor vote of the house and senate bypassing the committee structure		the public demonstrate the difficulty of it - There are a variety of public engagement activities currently being undertaken - There are excellent specific examples all over the where citizen voices are impacting policy

Comment Card: None

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P13PRAC
- involvement is limited to consultation not decision making - most people probably don't feel involved and are unaware of processes that are going on - still a (false) equation that citizen = local parochial views - low commitment of politicians to results of public participation - only limited number of people involved - people are involved once policy is almost decided if at all - politicians and policy makers fear losing control - science – participation: Natural science has more credibility with policy makers – obsession with numbers - examples of where it has been done well are few and far between - sometimes participation as "quick and	Scores: $1 \rightarrow 2$ $1 \rightarrow 1$ $2 \rightarrow 2$ $2 \rightarrow 2$ $3 \rightarrow 3$ $4 \rightarrow 4$ $3 \rightarrow 3$ **Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future**: <table><tr><td>Developing skills and understanding to write specs, evaluate tenders, allocate realistic budgets, timeframes, staff and dosh in public authorities and big corporations</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>Making participation more efficient and effective and monitor the costs and benefits</td><td>1.5</td></tr><tr><td>Internationally agreed criteria of what is "good practice" in public participation</td><td>4.5</td></tr><tr><td>Establishing public (e.g. parliamentary) institutions in charge of public participation processes</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>Development of policy in generally top – down therefore a genuine effective policy is problematic. Therefore we should be encouraging bottom-up development</td><td>2</td></tr></table>	- lay knowledge at least given lip services by policy making - people are starting to demand the right to be involved - public can exchange opinions via media - civil society organizations are quite actively involved - the public has informal ways to get involved (politicians, demonstrations) - at least they are informed and can judge by later voting they representatives - I run participation (stakeholder dialogue) at local policy level e.g. for landscapes protected habitats - There are genuine attempts to involve people - I am aware of some national cases where good public involvement has happened - Some new initiatives are being applied by Dutch government to involve the public - Some existing possibilities for public involvement - Increasing interest in participatory methods

dirty" - government departments and agencies don't "get it" and don't have skills/ understanding - relevant organisations don't give adequate resources (time, staff, money to be effective PP) - consultation is often limited to "window dressing" - effectively would mean that there is a measurable and guaranteed influence. I don't see that it's monitored/ evaluated - experience in working with authorities/ engineers.. shows that they are afraid of demands of the public - not "all" the public are represented/ involved in PAR - policy development is not always limited to the "situated" experiences of some publics - a serious lack of "evidence" to demonstrate "voice" influencing policy	Increase clarity in variety of methods for public participation and their intended results	4	- Attempts have been made to link policy with people

Comment Card:

Local (England) nature conservation cases: Dutch government; Belgian government; Scottish Environment.

What is public involvement → public participation = active involvement therefore don't forget existing methods e.g. referenda, voting, etc.

Assumption about level of policy? No it's at all levels not just national.

Who starts the "bottom-up" process?

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P14
- what would effective look like anyway? - Risk over taken by audit culture (blah!) - Too instrumentalist - Policy makers are often not committed to participatory results - There is a high risk of manipulation - Legislation and regulation developed without public input/ deliberation (stakeholders depend too narrowly and too strong a handle of e.g. big industry/ big players) - Often ad-hoc (not always bad) and too late; i.e. get involved but outcomes cannot feed into actual decision making - Because policy is made by powerful elites - There are important representation problems don't solved - Don't believe in citizen's competence - Often politicians/ decision makers find excuses why "public debate outcomes" not valid (e.g. do not know science for captured etc), rather than taking concerns seriously - Fear of granting legitimacy to illegitimate process - transparency	Scores: 2 → 2 　　　　2 → 2 　　　　2 → 2 　　　　3 → 3 　　　　3 → 3 　　　　2/3 → 2/3	- Policy makers realise the need for PP and commission processes - Different knowledge seen as "equal" at least by some decision makers - Because we do it a bit better than in the past - There is a growing demand from a number of different publics to have a say/ be consulted - We have opened up some space due to scrutiny/ scepticism of "authorities" - Because policy makers sometimes react to what they imagine public opinion to be, or respond to protest - Legitimacy is needed! Or even wanted? - Move away from "optimal" opinions. Appreciate compromise - Empowerment - To coopt the situated epistemologies of the subordinate - Some political instruments for publication already exist (e.g. local agenda 21) - Policy science has started to be publicly contested and political institutions have started to face the controversies that emerge - Academic / intellectual critics on the need of participation have started to penetrate the political arena

Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:

To fundamentally alter the power structure of society	4
Making participatory processes mandatory at different tiers of government	
To continue critical reflections on participation (conceptually and practically)	4
For longer term/ potentially large issues involve the public early on and upstream	3
To develop rules pf participation policy to make process operational	3
Reduce work dome for all! → evolve downward culture of "pillying people who work long hours"	5

	Play "role games" in PP	1	

Comment Card: None

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P15POL

- Less experience lead to failure in participation processes
- Different levels of commitment/ resistance from policy owners
- Considerable confusion due to people not discriminating in when to engage and when not to
- Lack of knowledge about how to be "effective" in influencing policy
- Political reality/ timing = processes where often "don't have time" to engage public
- It is not done on a regular basis
- framng is unclear may often be too m??????
- Unrealistic expectations from both policy makers and public about what engagement can achieve
- "policy" + "public" seen as 2 separate groups
- interest in participation is less because of missing support by policy makers
- the mindset is not there. Too many lies
- different topics/ themes needs first to establish in the public "information gap"
- perceived (wrongly or rightly) that public don't / can't understand issues from policy makers' perspective
- other pressures/ drivers e.g. cost effectiveness, legislation and regulation
	Scores: 3 → 3
	            3 → 3
	            3 → 3
	            4 → 4
	            6 → 6
		
		- public involvement can have positive effects in other areas (health, self esteem…)
		- communications and technology being better used in consultation
		- attempts at coordination/ sharing best practice across UK government
		- number of experiments in public involvement taking place
		- Not 0: there are indeed some consultations; there is a ???? between countries
		- Greater potential for effective contribution than often assumed
		- Civic culture of participation be establish step by step
		- Increased debate and discussion about involving public
		- Genuine interest from both policy makers and publics in making it work
		- Representative public interest in decision making process
		- Increased demand/ scrutiny from public; increased awareness of policy makers driving engagement
		- Individual interests becomes contrasting with collective interests and results in common conventions

Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:

Action	
Develop mechanisms for sharing best practice	5
Develop mechanisms for disseminating information to support participation	3
Develop culture of civic engagement	5
Be patient and learn from individual experience	1
Work on innovative approaches to engagement	
Challenge policy makers assumptions on the value of engagement	1

Comment Card: None

Negative reasons	How effectively are the public involved in policy development?	Positive reasons Code P16 POL

- it is in competition with other inputs to policy making
- public involvement is usually too late in the process to change policy
- input from public often doesn't inform policy decisions, despite exercise being carried out
- in the most relevant sectors participation is often not practiced
- it is a support, not a replacement of decision making structures
- most of "important" decisions are done without PP as without influence of public preferences
- the role of "participation" is still not very clear to the over all context of governance
- not enough money dedicated to PP
- in many countries no tradition for PP (such as Austria, Spain,…)
- many public exercises more about telling or convincing the public than listening to them
- often participation approaches/ public involvement is badly done
- no policy managing tools could get maximum score
	Scores: 3 → 2/5
	        2 → 2
	        4 → 4
	        1/9 → 1/9
		- competence of arranger matters soooo much → effect depends
		- in the right institutional setting a hood fit to frame conditions it can be very effective
		- if PP is to fit problem – situation it is likely to have some effect
		- because they are sometimes involved at least in some countries for some issues
		- EU policy texts reflect quite a progressive stance on participation
		- More inclusive methods are being used to get involvement (e.g. open days, workshops)
		- England & Wales public bodies are inviting public input on a wide variety of issues
		- Department of health pioneering large scale public involvement in policy making
		- Because there are laws requiring public participation (e.g. environmental impact assessment in EU)
		- There is financial support for transdisciplinary research in the EC or member countries
		- Public involvement in GHO debate, Natura 2000

Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:	
Institutionalisation – public funds	7?
Training of students concerning participation tools, methods. Part of the culture	
Obligatory evaluation of participation processes – results contract linking salary agreements	4
Put participatory approaches in a clearer picture of how it relates to the overall governance and how public involvement can be assured to follow quality and democratic standards	1

Comment Card: None

Action planning

"How effectively are the public involved in policy development?"

Suggested actions were taken from the H-diagrams and participants were asked to respond to the following questions:
- Why is it important?
- Who should be responsible for what to make it happen?
- How can they encourage it to happen?
- When should it be done?
- How will we know when it is done?

Action	Educate and encourage citizens to be reflective about their responsibility for shaping their environment (including social)
Why ?	So people will be motivated and be prepared to participate
Who?	- Schools - Process organisers
How?	Schools teach about self-governance and provide practice (group work) Schools provide substantive education of issues that arise on PP processes Schools offer classes in civics and give credit for students participating in such activities outside school Organisers of processes publicise the value of citizens opinions and show that citizen recommendations have impact on outcomes.
When?	Now
Done?	Increase response rate when citizens are asked to participate Increase initiation of PP by citizens
Action	Improve the transparency of how results of PP link to policy or decisions
Why ?	- Creates iterative improvement in the link between participation and policy-making - Helps reveal the values and rationale behind decisions
Who?	- Decision-makers need to give arguments for using, or not using, the inputs of participation - Practitioners need to make clear their methods (and advantages and disadvantages) - Participants reflect on feedback and improve input
How?	All groups should provide feedback

	- articulate explicit links between decisions and input - use a variety pf reporting mechanisms and disseminate findings - be honest about motivations
When?	Before, during and after participatory processes
Done?	Written evidence or other feedback appears showing how inputs were used
Action	Reduce logistical impediments to citizen participation
Why ?	Broad range of participants
Who?	Convenor (or foundation) to fund logistical support to participants/citizens/NGOs/users of PP processes - pressure governments to imitate Germany's policy on release time for political education/engagement - lobby employers/universities to recognise merit of PP service
How?	- provide financial/in-kind compensation for lost work/ home time - recognise PP as "political education" (release time from work) - provide child care - recognition of PP as career/education
When?	Now
Done?	Survey potential participants for why they did not choose to participate. They do not (or a reduced percentage) cite logistical financial reasons
Action	Develop skills and understanding to write specifications, evaluate tenders, allocate realistic budgets, timeframes, staff support and money in public authorities and big corporations
Why ?	Because most contemporary processes are top down – practitioners can not run effective processes and the organisations do not understand what is "good practice".
Who?	Public authorities in the first instance, must have willingness to supply resources. There is an important role here for civil society, NGOs "policy entrepreneurs" - so that it should not be such a top-down process. But where does government/corporation "willingness" come from? Educational role, focus on teachers and researchers educating the individuals in government and providing ongoing training in government/corporate organisations. Role for public controversy to apply the pressure that creates the willingness. However, we do not think that "good/best practice" is an appropriate approach/standard as it technicises what is fundamentally a political act, turning into a neutral tool.
How?	See previous
When?	On-going process

Done?	Never ending story but there may be some indicator that informs progress, such as changes in organisational decision and information flows, budget allocations, curricular changes, views on NGOs and other civil society actors that things have changed.
Action	- Plan timing of PP with decision making timetable More early public involvement
Why ?	Improve timing of feedback mechanisms (from public consultation) and integrate timing into decision making timetable. More possibility of public framing questions. Supports seriousness of process. More likely to lead to broader acceptance of process/outcomes. Public response must be collected at a time when it can be taken into consideration in final decision making process. Some decisions (eg road pricing) will only be implemented at early stage in political party's ruling period.
Who?	Need 'liaison point' for decision-makers and citizens which would get current issues in policy process noted and where citizens could access information and details; part of this would be a forum to decide what needs wider engagement and mobilise process. Citizens need to act and decision-makers willing to be open about what is going on.
How?	Something similar to the Danish board of technology with links to parliament and government but where citizens can have direct access. Important to have regional and local sub-offices. Lobby national government for this/petitions. Try to get seed funding for test case and how it would work.
When?	The sooner the better. Now.
Done?	When such "info-hub" and sub-centres are in place and used. Ie. PP launched earlier and feed into decision making process.
Action	Increase public participation incentives (eg. Fund pp adequately; provide other resources; buttress this by education; the fruits of PP will be used by policy makes)
Why ?	To build a culture of participation; to reduce a number of constraints; to make politicians take part more seriously.
Who?	- Generic: education institutions; ministry of industry - Topic specific: research centres; branches of government
How?	Schools: science education. Ministries: strategies and project planning. Research centres: strategies and project planning. Local governments: project appraisal
When?	Strategic: Upstream projects. General public: concept and design. Project-specific groups: beginning – middle – end (evaluation).
Done?	- feedback by politicians - project evaluation
Action	Set up independent institutions (organisations)

Why ?	- Get away from one-off efforts - continuous link to policy - independence is important so that people participate BUT needs to be respected by existing political structure
Who?	Depends on the political/cultural context of the country. Academics need to advocate this as a solution
How?	Advocate/advertise organisations to make it visible and accessible. Model on Danish Board of Technology – call it differently though – make it suit the mission. Sell it to politicians in that it may legitimise their decisions (the bait!). Make it easy access for individuals. More resources need to be committed. Encourage process to rebuild the rights and duties pf a citizen – collective process – encourage people to take part.
When?	ASAP. There is a variation across countries about how quickly this can be implemented
Done?	When there is an Institute for Public Participation. When everyone feels they are a citizens and can carry out their rights and duties – again related to the political process/context.
Action	Convert policymakers – Don't be afraid! Find mechanisms to take into account the fears of the powerful to open up to deliberation and participation
Why ?	Change through obligation is working neither effectively nor efficiently. If co-operation with willing powerful makes fun then life will be more wonderful, but for this their fears must be taken into account. Treat the most important barrier to participation. The have power, implement policies and also gatekeepers to process and whether participation takes place.
Who?	Everyone? Policymakers (their bosses); citizens who vote; practitioners and academics.
How?	Academics and practitioners: manage expectations; demonstrate benefits through past case studies. Citizens: write/phone/ lobby! Policymakers: learn and enjoy. Bosses – reward!
When?	Now!
Done?	Increase in truly collaborative and participatory projects funded. PPP become essential for projects (when appropriate) not a "luxury".
Action	Improving the transparency of the policy process
Why ?	Because it affects all others. Because access to information is a key aspect for participation. Because the normative framework is important. Because it reduces asymmetries. Because stakeholders will have to explain their arguments accountably.

Action	Publicize and emphasis the links between public consultation and resulting policy (which requires evaluating whether the is a link).
Why ?	Motivate public to participate. Create iterative improvement ion the link between participation and policy making. Increase credibility of participatory processes.
Action	Focus on transparency of policy process
Why ?	Would mean less abuse, manipulation and therefore less fatigue
Action	Policy-makers should have to describe in detail the factors that lead to the decision being made (transparency/accountability).
Why ?	Because it supports one of the few resources the public have in this arena – the fact that politicians need their vote. The more transparency, the more leverage the public will have.
Action	Setting up institutions/ organisations at national/European level being responsible for good practice. They are: competence centres; role models; piloting new approaches; evaluation of the PP process; driving the development
Why ?	Raise profiles of PP; provide resources; build capacity; awareness building; increase quality of PP; assure links to policymakers.
Action	Challenge the dominant policy through high-profile argument and protest
Why ?	Decision-makers will involve the public only if this is expected to legitimise their own policy or if that policy is effectively challenged beforehand.
Action	Legislate and independent body including industry; researchers; community voices (and maybe others) to design and manage compulsory participatory processes for major new policy initiatives. The our comes of the public deliberation go directly to floor debate – bypassing parliamentary/congressional committees. Citizens are randomly selected for compulsory participation (a la jury duty).
Why ?	We want deliberation to be the way public deliberation is done. So we want to institutionalise deliberation so it is the norm within the political process. To ensure democracy. Legitimise decision-making. More likely to protect common good.
Action	Better media coverage that doesn't trivialise issues
Action	Fund comparative research on public participation in policy-making
Why?	Improve policy recommendations. Understanding of the field improves.
Action	Make (from consensus focus to compromises) from differences an opportunity to learn. Do more research on new information society tools to explore how

	these can contribute to this good.
Why?	Focus on consensus excludes relevant points of view
Action	Think about connection between participatory research and research on participation
Action	Reduce working time for all! Evolve towards a culture that appreciates free-time (antidote to long-hours culture).
Why?	Makes it possible to participate. Break out of spiral of material status and positional good. Give more opportunity to reflect.
Action	Use primary and secondary education systems to teach people how to be deliberative, open and willing to revise their views. Develop a culture of engagement (supported by mechanisms for sharing best practice).
Why?	Participation will only work if we move towards a participatory culture, meaning awareness, willingness and competence to compete. This is the foundation for good governance.
Who?	Council of ministers of education. EU DG research program.