

## HOW CAN THE LEGITIMACY AND RESONANCE OF CLIMATE ASSEMBLIES IN WIDER SOCIETY BE ENSURED?

Draft Research Briefing, 1 June 2021

Prof. Ortwin Renn (Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies, IASS); Dr Dorota Stasiak (IASS); Azucena Morán (IASS); Dr Alina Averchenkova (Grantham Research Institute, LSE)<sup>1</sup>

*NOTE: This draft Briefing has been prepared on a short timescale for the launch of the Knowledge Network on Climate Assemblies (KNOCA) to inform discussion and debate amongst network members. A final version of the briefing will be produced that reflects on feedback from the launch and further evidence. **Please do not cite this draft briefing without permission of the authors.** Please send any comments on the draft to [info@knoca.eu](mailto:info@knoca.eu).*

*KNOCA is a new European network for sharing best practice on the design and implementation of climate assemblies. The network will host events and produce a range of practical resources, as well as coordinating research activities. We welcome individuals and organisations with experience or interest in either commissioning, running or analysing these processes and their outputs in Europe. Please reach out to us to share, discuss and inform best practice and new developments in climate assembly design, delivery and analysis.*

### 1. Key insights

- Climate assemblies (CAs) do not provide a blanket solution to addressing democratic deficiencies in legitimacy of public institutions or policies (such as low levels of trust in the government) but have much potential to bridge the widening gap between those who govern and those who are governed. They are most likely to resonate in a political context with neither too little nor too much antagonism, as was the case of the French CA.
- Legitimacy of CAs largely rests on ensuring representativeness, impartiality and inclusivity of the deliberative process and a governance structure that reflects thematic competence, fairness, and efficiency; an output that is able to respond to the needs of those who are or should be served by the respective policies under review; and a positive resonance and perception of the process among the wider public.

---

<sup>1</sup> We acknowledge the support of our colleagues Nicolina Kirby, Claudia Zwar, Dirk von Schneidmesser and Daniel Oppold (all IASS) in producing this Briefing.

- Visibility and publicity of CAs are critical for their success and effect. It is easier to attract attention to processes that are already institutionalised and/or supported by the government, the media or interest groups, and provide resources for publicity.
- Legitimacy of CAs is enhanced through integrating the assembly within the policy-making cycle and making clear linkages between the outputs and pending policy decisions, such as the commitment from the commissioning authority to respond to or act on participants' recommendations and/or to monitor their implementation.
- Ensuring legitimacy of expert input and defining what an independent and balanced representation of views means in practice for climate change policy, remains a key challenge for the commissioners and organizers of the CAs. Most critiques of past CAs focus on this aspect, yet existing literature on CAs offers little practical insight into best and most convincing practices.
- Support for CAs and their outcomes tends to increase when the wider public believes that the participants hold similar views to their own and see participants 'like them'. Random selection of participants, as well as emphasis on diverse background and voices in communication around the assembly, help strengthen CA's legitimacy and resonance.
- Ensuring legitimacy of the design and deliberation processes has been among the central considerations in the design of the CAs. Specific measures included an independent CA convener (e.g., in France and UK); random selection of members combined with an application of diversity criteria by demographics, economic and social backgrounds (all CAs), and diversity of attitudes towards climate change (e.g., UK, Scotland); and transparent elaborate procedures for selection of topics and expertise (e.g., all CAs used expert advisory committees).
- To include broader publics into their deliberations, the CAs in France and Ireland allowed for public submissions, while Scotland engaged with the Children's Parliament and schools to provide additional input. Furthermore, live broadcast of plenary sessions with experts and/or making recordings of sessions available (e.g., France, UK, Scotland, Ireland CAs) or virtual observer sessions allowing the public to engage in Q&As with speakers in the case of Scotland's CA provide examples for how to involve the broader public. Recent creative accounts of CA-experiences, for example, through documentaries (France, UK), TV shows, cartoons, and art exhibitions (France) provide additional channels for creating resonance. Their impact remains to be assessed.

## 2. Recommendations

- Both legitimacy and resonance-related concerns should be carefully considered at the process-design stage of CAs, while determining their remit, selection process for participants and experts, evidence base, integration into political cycle, public and media engagement and communication strategies.
- Particular attention should be devoted by organizers of CAs to enhance the legitimacy of expert input and ensure a balanced representation of views (e.g., different types of knowledge, multiple stakeholders providing input). Further research is needed into best practices based on past experiences with deliberative processes on climate change policies.
- While outreach strategies that entail measures of information sharing are crucial as a first step, they are not enough to trigger CAs' full potential. At a minimum, a CA should have a well-organized website

with the programme and schedule of the process, experts' input, submissions by interest groups and members of the public, and ideally videos, audio recordings, or transcripts of the plenary sessions to assure transparency. Broader engagement requires combining CAs with other forms of deliberative participation and designing additional forms and processes of public engagement *into* the process to ensure effective resonance in the political arena.

- Closer exchange among CAs could accelerate mutual learning from good practices, as well as from mistakes. There is, however, no universal recipe for gaining legitimacy and resonance: while drawing inspiration from one another, CAs should remain sensitive to their respective political, institutional and cultural contexts of agency and creatively approach respective challenges.

### **3. Challenge & related research questions**

An ever-growing number of deliberative spaces such as citizen assemblies, juries, citizen forums, planning cells and deliberative polls, known collectively as “deliberative mini-publics” (DMPs) have emerged in attempt to address deficits of legitimacy within government or representative institutions by including ordinary citizens in the decision-making process (Smith, 2009; Setälä, 2014). Climate assemblies (CAs) are one form of DMP that builds on the tradition of citizens' assemblies. From the policy-making perspective, DMPs are often seen as an instrument to either legitimize or increase public support for a particular policy or to generate new policy options or social mandates for policy makers to develop and adopt policies. Hence a perception of a CA as legitimate among the general public and political actors is key for it achieving its main political objectives and for having resonance in the wider society. At the same time, concerns are often raised as to whether CAs are representative of a larger population, whether they are qualified and suited to make policy recommendations or take decisions, in particular on such complex issues as those related to climate change policy that are perceived as highly technical and requiring specialised knowledge. CAs need to combine the elements of epistemic competency and democratic representation of diversity and inclusiveness in order to enhance the legitimacy of policy making. For this to be achieved, a certain degree of publicity and resonance beyond the narrow circle of actors engaged in respective CAs is indispensable.

It is challenging, as the resonance of the CAs depends not only on their features and communication strategies deployed, but also on a number of external factors, including the legal and constitutional setting within a country, as well as a “resonance-readiness” within the public and the political system. This may be impacted by the overall state of political consensus, public support to climate change action in the country and the stage of the climate policy cycle (e.g., a country that has already established a framework climate policy, with an ambitious emission target is different from a case where policy is at a much earlier stage). Although these contextual elements are hard to control, they should be taken into consideration in the strategy, process-design, and implementation of a CA. Learning from practice is necessary to better navigate challenges and to understand the opportunities and risks related to respective design choices.

In the following sections we highlight the key learnings from the academic debate about the legitimacy and resonance of DMPs and explore some examples of how these issues were addressed by the recent CAs in Denmark, France, Ireland, UK, and Scotland.

#### 4. Current knowledge

##### a. Perceptions of legitimacy of CAs

There are many approaches to defining legitimacy of deliberative processes in the literature (see Annex 1 for an overview). Some studies focus on normative legitimacy considering whether a randomly selected group of citizens is representative of the wider population, as well as on procedural qualities of deliberation including depth, breadth and balance of knowledge and perspectives presented during the deliberation; the quality of the deliberation itself; and the impact of citizens participation on democracy at large (Mansbridge, 2019). More procedural accounts of legitimacy discuss elements that target input, throughput, and output legitimacy (Scharpf & Schmid, 1999; Schmidt, 2013; Schmidt & Wood, 2019; Strebel et al., 2019). Input legitimacy relates to making sure that all citizens are represented in the deliberative process. Elements of throughput legitimacy including the extent to which the assembly's design, governance structure and deliberation are based on transparency, openness, diversity, and inclusiveness (Mansbridge, 2019; Pogrebinschi & Ryan, 2018). Output legitimacy is concerned with externally driven, non-procedural and outcome-based elements of CAs and assesses whether their outputs lead to actual policy outcomes (Pogrebinschi & Ryan, 2018; Scharpf, 2003; Strebel et al., 2019). Citizen assemblies can be judged by the extent to which their outputs respond to the needs of different publics, including through deepening the understanding of the participatory space across all affected communities, and having a clear link to the decision-making process.

##### i. Representativeness and inclusion

The claim for democratic legitimacy of CAs depends on whether the “small scale deliberation (the micro) can be meaningfully related to the public spaces of mass democracy (the macro)” (Olsen & Trenz, 2016). Selection of participants while accounting for representativeness and inclusiveness has become an inherent part of deliberative processes and a key factor of their legitimacy (Pow, 2021).

Measures to ensure input legitimacy around the CAs often rely on achieving representativeness through the randomized selection of lay citizens (OECD, 2020). However, randomized selection does not always result in greater legitimacy when compared to a process that relies on self-selection (Jacobs & Kaufmann, 2019). Hybrid mechanisms of selection may help avoid diminishing legitimacy when interested citizens - not chosen via random selection - are being excluded from the process of participation (ibid). Previous assessments have found that the legitimacy of a decision-making process is enhanced by including more citizens into the deliberative process (i.e., mass participation) (Pogrebinschi & Ryan, 2018 Jacobs, 2019). However, other scholars have warned that the deviation from random selection can introduce systematic biases since adding participants in different ways defies the principle of giving each citizen an equal chance to be selected (Bryson et al. 2013; Benighaus and Renn 2016; Bächtinger and Parkinson 2016). In this

context some of the CAs introduce measures to involve the broader public into the assembly, for example through submissions or open Q&A sessions (as discussed below).

Another aspect of legitimacy is inclusiveness, which focuses on measures to ensure equality, diversity, and equity. These include stratification and over-sampling of minorities and underrepresented groups, targeting specific populations in the selection protocols, support to participants through remuneration of expenses, and/or paying for childcare and eldercare to enable participants to take part (OECD, 2020). However, “the inclusive character of random selection is limited by the possibility to decline the invitation to deliberate” (Jacquet, 2017) or to not participate during the process. These challenges could be addressed by engaging under-represented communities in the governance structure of a CA (i.e., as convenors), creating community-owned spaces of deliberation during the process, effective facilitation techniques and/or decentralized institutional design. Furthermore, CAs can be supplemented and augmented by other forms and formats of deliberative participation, for example focus groups or round tables with selected individuals or groups that are not well represented in a random selection process.

## ii. Outputs and policy outcomes

While CAs often hold high levels of input and throughput legitimacy by ensuring “good deliberation and equal participation” (Pogrebinschi & Ryan, 2018), a question is often raised to what extent the CAs can and should aim to help address broader democratic deficiencies, such as low levels of trust in public institutions and policies. Many researchers agree that deliberative CAs can improve the legitimacy of public decision-making (c.f. Fung, 2006 Caluwaerts & Reuchamps, 2016; Ferejohn, 2008; Bächtiger et al., 2014; Boulianne, 2018; Setälä et al., 2010), by increasing the legitimacy of proposed policies, creating “desirable side-effects such as efficacy and trust” (Bächtiger et al., 2014, p. 226) and serving as a potential cure for public distrust.

In Finland, researchers found that participatory innovations could increase legitimacy of local governments, subject to perceptions of procedural fairness and satisfaction with the outcomes (Jäske, 2019). Similarly, an assessment of four deliberative spaces finds that a CA can legitimise a government body or a policy-cycle, but only if the process of the assembly itself is considered legitimate (Caluwaerts & Reuchamps, 2016). However, a survey-based empirical study in Estonia points to a more complex picture where a participatory process led to an increased trust in civil society, yet a decrease in citizens’ trust in political institutions (Karlsson et al., 2018). CAs therefore do not provide a blanket solution to addressing deficiencies in legitimacy of public institutions or policies and, in certain circumstances, other measures may be more appropriate.

Output legitimacy can also be improved through integration of a CA within the established policy-making structures and processes, and a clear linkage to public policy decisions, such as a commitment from the commissioning authority to respond to or act on the assembly’s recommendations, monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations and other means of providing for political accountability (OECD, 2020). The quality of these ties with the political process determines the breadth and strength of impact of the assembly and links to the resonance it creates in the wider public.

However, critics argue that CAs may not automatically have positive effects on democracy despite accounting for many normative and procedural concerns. Some believe that CAs represent a “shortcut”, which undermines democratic control over decision-making due to most people not having an opportunity to participate in deliberation, resulting in low trust in the process or outcomes (Lafont, 2020). Deliberation within CAs may also sideline citizens challenging governments through civil disobedience or the force of “a better argument” (Böker, 2017; Habermas, 1996). There are also concerns that CAs may try to address legitimacy through “artificially engineered” checklists, in which case “generalized use of mini-publics for political decision-making would diminish rather than increase the legitimacy of the deliberative system as a whole” (Lafont, 2015).

This suggests that enhancing legitimacy of climate change policy making would thus require focusing not only on process-oriented features of the CAs themselves, but also on other participatory spaces (e.g., counter-publics, or protest movements) and on the institutions whose legitimacy is directly affected by the deliberative processes (e.g. the governmental institutions that are commissioning the assembly; the political institutions that are expected to act on the CA’s recommendations, etc.). These voices also point to the importance of the broader resonance of the CAs.

#### b. The resonance of CAs

Equal participation and informed opinion alone cannot ensure democratic legitimacy of the CAs unless they represent opinions of the general public and “address and include all the citizens to whom collective decisions apply” (Olsen & Trenz, 2014). For CAs to exert influence and enhance the legitimacy of decisions, they must gain publicity across the broader political system; make it resonate. “Public resonance” is the way the public audience responds to other actors participating in the public sphere (Strydom, 2003). What matters here is both the “resonance in the public”, as well as the “resonance of institutions” (Eder, 2000, p. 178; Setälä et al., 2010).

#### i. Perception among involved citizens and the broader public

Perception and effects of CAs (and deliberative mini-publics generally) are analysed both with respect to the citizens directly involved and the broader public that is not participating in a given process. Most studies have focused on the internal dynamics of CAs and their effect on individuals (c.f. Setälä et al., 2010). They suggest, for example, that being involved in a CA improves a person’s ability to participate in other political processes and augments overall trust that citizens can meaningfully engage in debating and solving complex issues (Farrell et al., 2019; Roberts & Escobar, 2015). However, others caution that a sole focus on participants of the assemblies is insufficient, not least because most CAs only include a relatively small number of citizens leaving the effect on the large majority of non-participating citizens unexplored (Jacobs & Kaufmann, 2019), especially if CAs “remain essentially ‘black boxes’” for the outside audience (Rummens, 2016, p. 138).

However, CAs and other deliberative engagement efforts “could transform not only their participants but also the larger public” (Gastil et al., 2012, pp. 214–215). For example, when surveyed on the “quality of judgments”, Oregon voters viewed the Oregon Citizens’ Initiative Review (an established DMP) as the

most credible body (alongside criminal juries), comparing favourably to the state legislature and Congress (Warren & Gastil, 2015, pp. 570–571). Being informed about the view of a CA can influence the opinions of ordinary citizens about policies. Early experimental research on the perceptions around citizens' assemblies by the general public suggests that variations in the characteristics of the design and application of CAs – such as their size, and length of time spent deliberating – may influence their impact on public opinion, their perceived legitimacy and resonance (Boulianne, 2018).

A study on perceptions of citizens' assemblies based on a survey of citizens in 15 European countries found that support for CAs was heterogeneous: it was strongest among those who were less educated, had a lower sense of political competence, and who saw elites in a negative light (Pilet et al., 2020). Support for CAs increased when respondents believed their fellow citizens held similar views to their own. Random selection of participants helps other citizens to see participants as “like them”, and to consider mini-publics legitimate (Pow et al., 2020). A survey of attitudes towards a citizens' assembly addressing a contentious constitutional question in Ireland, found that “like me” perceptions were a significant predictor of the perception of legitimacy, particularly when respondents perceived politicians to be *unlike* them (ibid). Similarly, analysis of the referendum exit poll on the recommendation from the British Columbia Citizens' Assembly (BCCA) on Electoral Reform provided early evidence that most voters who were aware of the Assembly were influenced by its judgments. Voters particularly appreciated the “ordinariness” of the BCCA - that it was made up of citizens from all walks of life - and were attracted by the expertise that assembly members gained (Cutler et al., 2008).

## ii. The role of effective public communication

Visibility and publicity of CAs are critical for their success and effect, as “participation possibilities will not have any impact on the wider public unless citizens in the wider public know of the existence of these processes” (Jäske, 2019). Studies show that it is easier to attract attention to processes that are already institutionalised and/or supported by the government, the media or interest groups, and provide resources for publicity work ( Jäske, 2019; Gastil et al., 2018). However, there are several other elements at play. For example, the abandonment of a CA in Australia in 2010 shows how the highly polarised political debate around climate change can create adverse conditions for a CA and lead to intensified criticism of the process (Boswell et al., 2013). CAs are most likely to resonate in a “political context with neither too little nor too much antagonism”, in areas of “productive tension” (ibid). The criticism that greeted the failed Australian climate assembly stands in contrast to the resonance of the French Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat (CCC). Polling conducted in the week following the final session of the CCC found that 70% of the French population had heard of the CA, and a poll by Odoxa found the French population supported most of the 149 proposals (Mellier & Wilson, 2020). In case of the nationwide CAUK conducted at the same time, public awareness was however relatively low (Mellier & Wilson, 2020).

For climate assemblies to have an impact beyond those directly involved in them, public engagement needs to be designed *into* the process (Wells et al., 2021). Effective public communication enhances not only the public support for recommendations developed within a CA, but also the general acceptance for



deliberative processes in policy making (OECD, 2020). Practical examples show that for best effects “an active effort to reach a wide range of citizens to increase awareness of the process and its purpose” is needed. It is not enough to make information simply available (OECD, 2020, p. 9; Wells et al., 2021). Effective overall communication strategy and execution of specific details (e.g., the proper design of invitations) may help convey the image of CA as an important form of democracy and encourage the citizens to engage (Gerwin, 2018, p. 44).

### iii. Access to the (information about) process

There is a debate in the theory of deliberation on whether open forums, which increase opportunities for public scrutiny, or closed designs, which insulate participants from publicity are more preferential for DMPs (Chambers, 2005). At a minimum, a CA should have a well-organized website with the programme and schedule of the process, experts’ input, submissions by interest groups and members of the public, and ideally videos, audio recordings, or transcripts of plenary sessions (Farrell et al., 2019). Analysis of over 1100 submissions to the Irish climate assembly found that the written submission model may represent a “*midi-public*”: a bridge between the mini-public of the CA and the broader population (Devaney, Brereton et al., 2020; Devaney, Torney et al., 2020). At the same time under this model, it is important to have a clear understanding on how the submissions will be dealt with, otherwise it can backfire and create a feeling of wasted effort by those who provided input, and dissatisfaction with, and critique of, the legitimacy of the process (ibid).

### iv. Role of the media

The media are also considered essential for perceived legitimacy and resonance of democratic innovations. Escobar and Elstub (2017) observe however that “[n]ew democratic practices require new media narratives, and these may be prevented if mini-publics are covered using the tropes of traditional political reporting (i.e. “winners and losers”, “governing by focus group”, citizen involvement as an “abdication of responsibility”).” Similarly, Olsen and Trenz point to the risk that the media focus on polarisation, rather than the “consensus and common ground” that can emerge in a mini-public (Olsen & Trenz, 2014, p. 129). This points to the importance for CAs to have an active strategy for media engagement, potentially including early awareness raising and education of the media on the topic to help generate greater interest and enable more balanced and informed reporting.

### v. Resonance within the policy process

Another debated issue relates to securing the resonance of CAs within the policy process. Krick (2021) highlights a tension between studies that show that political resonance increases when consultation is embedded in the policy process, and those showing that this embedding can undermine the independence of CAs and their “generated expertise”. Setälä (2017) suggests that publishing the recommendations of CAs, and policy-makers’ responses to them, could help to improve the resonance of these processes without undermining their autonomy.



## 5. How have climate change assemblies addressed legitimacy and resonance?

### a. Selection of participants and governance

Rapid review of the climate citizens assemblies in France, Ireland, Denmark, UK and Scotland and several exploratory interviews with the organisers show that legitimacy considerations were taken into account in their design to some extent, in particular in respect to: (i) legitimacy and independence of the convening organisation; (ii) the selection process of the assembly members; and (iii) legitimacy of expert input through measures to balance the representation of the various points of views and the form of presentation.

Legitimacy and independence of the convener was highlighted as an important consideration in all of the interviews and was explicitly part of the public debate in France (informant 1). Approaches to choosing the convener varied, with some CA's going for an independent third party (France, UK), and others keeping close involvement of the civil service (Denmark and to some extent Ireland).

All CAs use processes to ensure representativeness and inclusiveness based on random selection of members combined with an application of diversity criteria related to demographics, economic and social backgrounds. Some assemblies, such as the UK, added diversity of attitudes towards climate change as an additional criterion for the selection. To include broader publics into their deliberations, the CAs in France and Ireland allowed for public submissions, while Scotland engaged with the Children's Parliament, and schools to provide additional input to the CA.

Considerations around the process of conduct of the assembly were highlighted as central concerns for all of the organizers. In particular it was important to ensure that inputs were balanced, and experts were not driving the conclusions of the assembly towards a particular result (informants 1, 2, 3, 4). *"A challenge was to provide impartial expertise through the choice of experts. The approach was to look purely for experts and not advocates, so they would not be seen as pushing their positions"* (informant 3, on the Irish CA). Commenting on the UK's experience informant 4 agrees: *"It was our job to ensure legitimacy of the assembly by creating a transparent process with balanced representation of views. Even if you disagree with the expert's views you had to go ahead."*

Specific measures included setting transparent governance arrangements and procedures for selection of expertise. All of the CAs set up advisory committees to support selection of the key topics and experts. Some had more elaborate governance (e.g., France set up 5 different committees), while others relied on several nominated expert leads to manage the process. Yet all of the assemblies faced some criticism from a limited group of stakeholders questioning the balance of presented expertise. Importance of legitimacy of the presented expertise was emphasized in particular in the political contexts where *"many civil servants remain sceptical about the CA and argue that citizens can be influenced by experts"* (informant 4). This highlights the need of enhancing the perception of CA's legitimacy specifically among the politicians and the government. Further analysis is required on strategies for enhancing legitimacy in this respect (e.g., targeted awareness building and outreach to the key political actors; getting high level champions to support the assembly, etc.).

Independence of expertise, or epistemic legitimacy, remains a critical area for CAs. Further empirical research is required into different approaches taken by the past assemblies, the perception and feedback on how the assembly members experience expert input on climate change and the linkages to the perceptions around legitimacy of the outcome and resonance among the politicians and broader public.

#### b. Legitimacy of the outcomes

Clarity around the way the CA's outcomes would be treated by the political process was raised as a key factor for legitimacy and resonance of climate assemblies by all informants. There are notable differences among the approaches taken in this respect. The French CA at the outset had direct support and presence of the head of state, which has given the assembly a high political profile, supported its legitimacy and sustained media interest early on. However, a vast number of its recommendations on how to reduce CO2 emissions were eventually rejected by the parliament. This broke the promise made by President Macron earlier that the recommendations would be followed and had a detrimental impact on the output legitimacy and resonance of the assembly (informant interview 1). The CAs in the UK and Denmark had no clear pathway for how the recommendations will be dealt with by the political process. While the findings were presented to the respective parliaments, there was a lack of clear political plan for consideration of the recommendations from the outset of the process. Arguably these assemblies received less media attention, and many of their political outcomes still remain to be seen.

Further research is necessary to clarify whether and how consistency in the treatment of the outputs of the assemblies has impacted political and media attention and the broader resonance of the assembly, as well as in the perception of its output legitimacy among the political actors and wider public.

#### c. Broader political context and controversies

Broader political context was highlighted as another important factor for the perceptions of legitimacy and public attention devoted to the climate assemblies. In France, questioning of the legitimacy of the elected politicians by President Macron during the elections, the desire of the population to gain greater control over decision-making, pre-existing positive attitude towards CAs, pressure from the NGOs and a strong social movement on inequality have supported public interest in the Convention and strengthened its legitimacy and resonance (informant 1). This contrasts with the experience of Denmark where the CA was introduced by a political party *“as a democratic innovation with the expectation that citizens would put pressure on the government to take stronger action against the backdrop of generally low understanding among the politicians and the public of the concept of citizen assembly”* (informant 2). Further research is required to understand to whether and how differences in the broader political context and attitudes toward deliberative democracy impact legitimacy and resonance, as well as the impact of climate assemblies.

Interesting examples emerge on the linkages between evidence on the consistency of outcomes with the broader public opinion and the perceptions of legitimacy of climate assemblies. In Ireland, high prominence of the debate on legalisation of abortion, which was the primary initial focus of the Citizens' Assembly 2016-2018, has helped increase attention to its deliberations on climate change (informant 3).

When a national referendum on abortion showed the same voting pattern as the Assembly, it provided retrospective legitimacy to its recommendations on climate (ibid). In France, independent surveys of public opinion on the key political issues were found consistency with the distribution of opinions among the members of the Convention (Giraudet et al., 2021). An assessment of the impact of such targeted efforts on the perception of legitimacy among the wider public and their potential to serve as tool to improve legitimacy requires further research.

Political controversies around CAs are often framed around legitimacy concerns and have implications for resonance of outcomes. For example, in Scotland, Extinction Rebellion initially argued for the CA, but later provided a conflict frame by withdrawing support for it. There was also friction with XR on the choice of experts in the Evidence Group". In the UK, some experts providing input into the CA were criticized as being "*climate advocates*" by an organisation holding climate sceptic views (informant 4). In Ireland, the climate CA was critiqued by climate sceptics and some sectors that disagreed with the outcomes on the ground of "*not having an explicit for/against perspective presented and CAs not being the right way of arriving at policy decisions*" (informant 3).

Concerns around legitimacy of climate change assemblies can be used by actors that disagree with the outcomes as means to advance their political agenda, however a deeper analysis would be required to fully test this assertion. While political controversies seem to help draw media attention to the assemblies, they may have detrimental impact on the perceptions of their legitimacy which may affect in turn the uptake of the recommendations by the political process. These issues require further analysis drawing on a larger sample of interviews involving a variety of actors.

#### d. Access to the information about process

All analysed CAs had dedicated communication channels, although the number and diversity of these channels, the level of detail and accessibility of information and frequency of communications vary greatly. The CAs had dedicated websites (the Danish CA is hosted on the Ministry's website), and used Twitter (e.g., Ireland, UK, Scotland) and Instagram (e.g., UK, Scotland). Some assemblies also broadcasted and/or made available recordings of session with the experts on YouTube (e.g., France, UK, Scotland, Ireland) for the broader public to follow. In Scotland, a virtual observer session was hosted at each weekend on the evidence base and deliberative process allowing the public to engage in Q&As with speakers; there was also an opportunity to apply to observe the assembly.

Most assemblies provided transparent information on the selection of experts and citizens. This includes information on the recruitment and the demographics of participants (e.g., France, Scotland, UK); rules of procedure, voting, transparency on errors and corrections (e.g., Ireland). Some assemblies were transparent on the costs (e.g., Ireland, UK).

In France and Ireland, the CAs allowed for public input in the form of submissions. The submissions and their overview are made public, although informant 1, who commented on the French experience, noted that there was not a clear plan for how to integrate that input into the assembly. CA in UK links to wider

society through testimonies in support of the assembly by academic, business, and religious leaders. Group deliberations were kept confidential in all the CAs to prevent external influences.

#### e. Media and public engagement

Media and public engagement have been part of CA communications strategies, although with varying levels of emphasis and resource base. Some CAs appointed professional communication teams to manage media and public engagement (e.g., Ireland, France, UK) and designated media spokespersons. Most assemblies issued regular press releases and some (e.g., France, Ireland) held targeted media briefings with key outlets. In France, the media was given extensive access to the assembly's gatherings and proceedings. While anonymity was maintained by organisers, the members had permission to go public on social or traditional media and were encouraged by the organizers to reach out to their local community between sessions and meet with stakeholders (informant 1). Media trainings were provided for those who wished to talk to the media (ibid). The Danish CA in turn has external communication under close control by the Ministry (informant 2). This CA's budget is low compared to the other examples considered, which affects the resources devoted to communication: unlike some other CAs it does not seem to have a dedicated social media channel and does not engage external communication companies.

An important consideration for how the assembly is perceived is who becomes its spokesperson(s). Most CA communications quote a combination of the conveners, experts, and members of the CAs. However, it was challenging to find diversity of voices in communication from the CA members, as members with more prior experience and higher education were more comfortable talking to the media (informants 1 and 2). In Ireland, the chair acted as the main spokesperson and none of the members or experts were allowed to speak to media while the topic was being considered - a precaution due to the controversy around abortion (informant 3). Unlike in France, participants in Ireland were not encouraged to be a collective voice (informant 3). In the UK, the cited assembly members are generally on the younger side. The French and the UK's climate CAs have been covered in documentaries, while in France the CA is also a subject of cartoons, art exhibitions and TV shows.

A detailed analysis of the media coverage was out of the scope of this project, however a high-level scan of media citations on the climate CAs shows limited coverage on the Scottish and Danish assemblies, and extensive coverage of the CAs in France, Ireland, and the UK by the major national media outlets. The extent to which this may relate to the former assemblies being purely online is unclear; neither have they produced their final reports. It would be important for future research to conduct a deeper review of public communication and engagement practices of CAs against the perceptions of resonance they achieved through media coverage, interviews, and public opinion surveys to deliver practical recommendations on what works under different circumstances.

#### f. Resonance within the political process

Resonance within the political process can be measured by investigating the attitudes of the key political actors towards the assembly and its outcomes, as well as by the uptake of the outcomes by the political process. Some of the impacts however can be observed only in long-term studies. Such detailed empirical

assessment was outside of the scope of this project. However, the interviews and the analysis of the outcomes of the assemblies have raised relevant considerations for the future research agenda in this area.

The French assembly has created a broader political momentum with several jurisdictions not legally responsible for implementing its measures having committed to doing so (informant 1). The members of the CA have created an NGO with the goal of monitoring how the recommendations are considered (Les 150). Arguably the assembly has also had impact on the new climate change legislation. In Ireland, the debate on abortion has given additional political weight to the deliberations on climate change. Political attention to climate change over the past few years has improved, although the impact of the CA is difficult to separate from other developments such as 1.5-degree report by the IPCC and strong international social movement on climate (informant 2). In the UK, the CA impacted the community already working on climate change helping understand the leanings from citizen's experiences (informant 4). The conclusions of the assembly are being used by the UK Committee on Climate Change in their work on the net zero strategy. However, the CAUK arguably has not reached the wider public with Brexit and Covid among other issues taking political attention; it has not effectively engaged government actors and lacks a high-level champion (informant 4).

Further comparative analysis is required to understand the effectiveness of strategies to gain political resonance in various climate change assemblies and to assess their short-term and longer-term impacts on the political debate and policymaking on climate change.

## **6. Research methods statement**

This research briefing is based on the rapid review of the literature related to legitimacy and resonance of CAs and other forms of DMP, the communication mediums of the national climate citizens assemblies in France, Denmark, Ireland, Scotland, and the UK (e.g., their websites) and a scan of media coverage. This was complemented by several exploratory semi-structured interviews with the organizers or experts that provided input into the assemblies. The briefing does not claim to have provided an exhaustive literature review or comprehensive empirical analysis. Its purpose is to identify key themes, early learnings, and areas for future research.

## **7. Future Network Activities/ Research program for the next stage**

In the future network activities, we suggest combining the elements of knowledge integration, prototyping and research.

**Knowledge integration:** Recognizing that much knowledge around CAs is generated on the ground and vested in experience of the practitioners, we would seek to facilitate a systematic exchange and mutual learning among actors already engaged or interested in CAs, such as: initiators and organizers of CAs, facilitators, observers, (scientific) evaluators, as well as ex-participants. Being involved in the evaluation

of the first national German CA on Foreign Policy, the IASS could also contribute empirical results based on quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews with organizers, moderators, and politicians.

**Prototyping:** Building on our involvement within KNoCA and on our expertise in co-creative approaches we wish to support shaping and designing participative processes of high legitimacy and resonance and cooperate with those actors who want to establish a CA. In particular, we see the need of conceptualising the process design of respective CAs in such a way, that it fits to a given socio-political context and the concrete goals to be accomplished.

**Research:** In order to gather evidence and reflect on potentials and barriers of CAs as a methodology for addressing environmental challenges, we wish to facilitate exchange and cooperation among interested scholars, contributing to joint research initiatives and debate on most challenging questions around (legitimacy and resonance of) CAs. In addition, by fostering exchange among scholars and practitioners of CAs, we want to initiate transdisciplinary research endeavours, which combine scientific and practical relevance.

Several suggested paths for further research have been named throughout this paper. More profound empirical understanding of the linkages between the key design features of the CAs, transparency of the process, communication strategies and perceptions of their legitimacy and resonance in the broader society would require an extensive study involving a larger set of interviews with the key political actors, CA members, media, NGOs, private sector, and citizens. Such analysis would deliver valuable insights for the commissioners and organisers of the assemblies on practical strategies to enhance legitimacy and resonance.

A future research agenda should provide greater insight into perceptions of climate CAs' legitimacy and resonance among the politicians and on strategies to enhance them. This could include ex-ante and ex-post opinion surveys among key groups including policymakers and the general public in countries where CAs will be organized in a near future (Germany, Spain, Austria). It could also provide means to assess the impact of targeted efforts to demonstrate consistency between the views of the CA members with those of the general public on the perception of climate CA's legitimacy. Additionally, research on how the level of clarity and consistency in the treatment of the outputs of the climate CA's impacts political and media attention and its broader resonance is required to improve knowledge base strategies to enhance impact of CAs. Another research stream should consider the impact of political controversies and legitimacy deficiencies resonance of CAs and on the uptake of their outcomes by the political process. It would also be useful to conduct a deeper assessment of communication and engagement strategies used by CAs against the perceptions of resonance they achieved through review of media coverage, interviews, and public opinion surveys and to develop toolkits for the CA conveners on enhancing legitimacy and resonance of CAs.



## 8. Bibliography

- Bächtiger, A., & Parkinson, J. (2016). *Mapping and Measuring Deliberation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bächtiger, A., Setälä, M., & Grönlund, K. (2014). Towards a New Era of Deliberative Mini-publics. In B. e. a. Grönlund (Ed.), *Deliberative mini-publics* (pp. 225–246).
- Benighaus, C. & Renn, O. (2016). Teil A Grundlagen. In: C. Benighaus, G. Wachinger, & O. Renn (Hrsg): *Bürgerbeteiligung*
- Böker, M. (2017). Justification, critique and deliberative legitimacy: The limits of mini-publics. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 16(1), 19–40. <https://doi.org/10.1057/cpt.2016.11>
- Boswell, J., Niemeyer, S., & Hendriks, C. M. (2013). Julia Gillard's Citizens' Assembly Proposal for Australia: A Deliberative Democratic Analysis. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 48(2), 164–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10361146.2013.786675>
- Boulianne, S. (2018). Mini-publics and Public Opinion: Two Survey-Based Experiments. *Political Studies*, 66(1), 119–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321717723507>
- Bryson, J. M., Quick, K. S., Slotterback, C. S. and Crosby, B. C. (2013). Designing public participation processes. *Public Administration Review*, 73(1), 23–34
- Caluwaerts, D., & Reuchamps, M. (2016). Generating Democratic Legitimacy through Deliberative Innovations: The Role of Embeddedness and Disruptiveness. *Representation*, 52(1), 13–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00344893.2016.1244111>
- Chambers, S. (2005). Measuring publicity's effect: Reconciling empirical research and normative theory. *Acta Politica*, 40(2), 255–266.
- Cutler, F., Johnston, R., Carty, R. K., Blais, A., & Fournier, P. (2008). Deliberation, information, and trust: the British Columbia Citizens' Assembly as agenda setter. In M. E. Warren & H. Pearse (Eds.), *Designing Deliberative Democracy* (pp. 166–191). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511491177.010>
- Devaney, L., Brereton, P., Torney, D., Coleman, M., Boussalis, C., & Coan, T. G. (2020). Environmental literacy and deliberative democracy: a content analysis of written submissions to the Irish Citizens' Assembly on climate change. *Climatic Change*, 162(4), 1965–1984. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-020-02707-4>
- Devaney, L., Torney, D., Brereton, P., & Coleman, M. (2020). Ireland's Citizens' Assembly on Climate Change: Lessons for Deliberative Public Engagement and Communication. *Environmental Communication*, 14(2), 141–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2019.1708429>
- Eder, K. (2000). Zur Transformation nationalstaatlicher Öffentlichkeit in Europa. *Berliner Journal Für Soziologie*, 10(2), 167–184.
- Escobar, O., & Elstub, S. (2017). *Forms of mini-publics: An introduction to deliberative innovations in democratic practice*. Research and Development Note. New Democracy. <https://www.newdemocracy.com.au/2017/05/08/forms-of-mini-publics/>
- Farrell, D. M., Curato, N., Dryzek, J. S., Geissel, B., Grönlund, K., Marien, S., Niemeyer, S., Pilet, J.-B., Renwick, A., Rose, J., Setälä, M., & Suiter, J. (2019). Deliberative mini publics: Core design features. *The Centre for Deliberative Democracy & Global Governance Working Paper Series*, 2019(5). <https://lirias.kuleuven.be/2853089?limo=0>
- Ferejohn, J. (2008). Conclusion: the Citizens' Assembly model. In M. E. Warren & H. Pearse (Eds.), *Designing Deliberative Democracy* (pp. 192–213). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511491177.011>
- Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x>



- Gastil, J., Knobloch, K., & Kelly, M. (2012). Evaluating Deliberative Public Events and Projects. In T. Nabadni (Ed.), *Democracy in motion: Evaluating the practice and impact of deliberative civic engagement*. Oxford University Press.
- Gastil, J., Knobloch, K. R., Reedy, J., Henkels, M., & Cramer, K. (2018). Assessing the Electoral Impact of the 2010 Oregon Citizens' Initiative Review. *American Politics Research*, 46(3), 534–563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X17715620>
- Gerwin, M. (2018). *Citizens' Assemblies: Guide to democracy that works*. Otway Plan.
- Giraudet, L.-G., Apouey, B., Arab, H., Baeckelandt, S., Begout, P., Berghmans, N., Blanc, N., Boulin, J.-Y., Buge, E., Courant, D., Dahan, A., Fabre, A., Fourniau, J.-M., Gaborit, M., Granchamp, L., Guillemot, H., Jeanpierre, L., Landemore, H., Laslier, J.-F., . . . Tournus, S. (2021). *Deliberating on Climate Action: Insights from the French Citizens' Convention for Climate*. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03119539/>
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. *Studies in contemporary German social thought*. MIT Press.
- Jacobs, D. (2019). *Deliberative Mini-Publics and Perceived Legitimacy: The Effect of Size and Participant Type*.
- Jacobs, D., & Kaufmann, W. (2019). The right kind of participation? The effect of a deliberative mini-public on the perceived legitimacy of public decision-making. *Public Management Review*, 23(1), 91–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1668468>
- Jacquet, V. (2017). Explaining non-participation in deliberative mini-publics. *European Journal of Political Research*, 56(3), 640–659. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12195>
- Jäske, M. (2019). Participatory innovations and maxi-publics: The influence of participation possibilities on perceived legitimacy at the local level in Finland. *European Journal of Political Research*, 58(2), 603–630. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12304>
- Karlsson, M., Adenskog, M., & Åström, J. (2018). Political scandal, online participation and the rebuilding of institutional legitimacy: The case of the Estonian Citizens' Assembly. Long Live Democracy Conference, Oxford Internet Institute (OII). *Long Live Democracy Conference, Oxford Internet Institute (OII)*.
- Krick, E. (2021). Dealing with the epistemic-democratic tension in policy-making. Institutional design choices for multi-layered democratic innovations. *Political Research Exchange*, 3(1), 1893608.
- Lafont, C. (2015). Deliberation, Participation, and Democratic Legitimacy: Should Deliberative Mini-publics Shape Public Policy? *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 23(1), 40–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopp.12031>
- Lafont, C. (2020). *Democracy without Shortcuts: A Participatory Conception of Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Mansbridge, J. (2019). Deliberative Polling Comes of Age. *The Good Society*, 27(1-2), 118–129. <https://doi.org/10.5325/goodsociety.27.1-2.0118>
- Mellier, C., & Wilson, R. (November 2020). *Getting Climate Citizens' Assemblies Right*. Carnegie Europe. <https://carnegieeurope.eu/2020/11/05/getting-climate-citizens-assemblies-right-pub-83133>
- OECD. (2020). *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions: Catching the Deliberative Wave*. OECD Publishing.
- Olsen, E., & Trenz, H.-J. (2016). The micro–macro link in deliberative polling: Science or politics? *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*(19 (6)), 662–679. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230.2014.983363>
- Olsen, E. D. H., & Trenz, H.-J. (2014). From Citizens' Deliberation to Popular Will Formation? Generating Democratic Legitimacy in Transnational Deliberative Polling. *Political Studies*, 62, 117–133. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12021>

- Pilet, J.-B., Bol, D., Paulis, E., Vittori, D., & Panel, S. (2020). *Public Support for Citizens' Assemblies Selected through Sortition: Survey and Experimental Evidence from 15 Countries*. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/dmv7x>
- Pogrebinschi, T., & Ryan, M. (2018). Moving beyond input legitimacy: When do democratic innovations affect policy making? *European Journal of Political Research*, 57(1), 135–152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12219>
- Pow, J. (2021). Mini-Publics and the Wider Public: The Perceived Legitimacy of Randomly Selecting Citizen Representatives. *Representation*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00344893.2021.1880470>
- Pow, J., van Dijk, L., & Marien, S. (2020). Special Issue: Democracy without Shortcuts. *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/10.16997/jdd.368>
- Roberts, J., & Escobar, O. (2015). *Involving communities in deliberation: a study of 3 citizens' juries on onshore wind farms in Scotland*, ClimateXChange. ClimateXChange and The University of Edinburgh.
- Rummens, S. (2016). Legitimacy Without Visibility? On the Role of Mini-Publics in the Democratic System. In M. Reuchamps & J. Suiter (Eds.), *Constitutional Deliberative Democracy in Europe* (pp. 129–146). ECPR Press. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2736464>
- Scharpf, F. W. (2003). *Problem-solving effectiveness and democratic accountability in the EU* (MPIfG Working Paper 03/1). Cologne: Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies. <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/41664>
- Scharpf, F. W., & Schmid, C. (1999). *Regieren in Europa: Effektiv und demokratisch? Schriften des Max-Planck-Instituts für Gesellschaftsforschung Köln Sonderband*. Campus Verlag. [http://www.mpifg.de/pu/mpifg\\_book/mpifg\\_sbd\\_fs1999.pdf](http://www.mpifg.de/pu/mpifg_book/mpifg_sbd_fs1999.pdf)
- Schmidt, V., & Wood, M. (2019). Conceptualizing throughput legitimacy: Procedural mechanisms of accountability, transparency, inclusiveness and openness in EU governance. *Public Administration*, 97(4), 727–740. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12615>
- Schmidt, V. A. (2013). Democracy and Legitimacy in the European Union Revisited: Input, Output and 'Throughput'. *Political Studies*, 61(1), 2–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2012.00962.x>
- Setälä, M. (2014). *Deliberative Mini-Publics: Involving Citizens in the Democratic Process*. ECPR Press.
- Setälä, M. (2017). Connecting deliberative mini-publics to representative decision making. *European Journal of Political Research*, 56(4), 846–863. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12207>
- Setälä, M., Grönlund, K., & Herne, K. (2010). Citizen Deliberation on Nuclear Power: A Comparison of Two Decision-Making Methods. *Political Studies*, 58(4), 688–714. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2010.00822.x>
- Smith, G. (2009). *Democratic Innovations: Designing Institutions for Citizen Participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Strebel, M. A., Kübler, D., & Marcinkowski, F. (2019). The importance of input and output legitimacy in democratic governance: Evidence from a population-based survey experiment in four West European countries. *European Journal of Political Research*, 58(2), 488–513. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12293>
- Strydom, P. (2003). Resonance: Triggering a dormant dimension of the public sphere. In V. Kiltygin & V. Zhukov (Eds.), *European Social Theory: Sources and Challenges* (pp. 83–99). Research network on social theory of the European Sociological Association.
- Warren, M. E., & Gastil, J. (2015). Can Deliberative Minipublics Address the Cognitive Challenges of Democratic Citizenship? *The Journal of Politics*, 77(2), 562–574. <https://doi.org/10.1086/680078>
- Wells, R., Howarth, C., & Brand-Correa, L. I. (2021). *Are citizen juries and assemblies on climate change driving democratic climate policymaking? An exploration of two case studies in the United Kingdom*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-273650/v1>

## Annex 1 Selected approaches to legitimacy

Normative and Perceived Legitimacy	Process-oriented Legitimacy	External and Internal Legitimacy
<p>1. <b>Normative Legitimacy:</b> It is concerned with representativeness, knowledge, and the quality of deliberation. It assesses whether the randomly-selected group of citizens is representative of the wider population; how comprehensive and accurate are the types of knowledge and material present during the deliberation; the-quality of the deliberation; and/or whether the participation of citizens had positive effects on democracy at large (Mansbridge, 2019).</p> <p>2. <b>Perceived Legitimacy:</b> It is concerned with how the deliberation is perceived by the different public spheres. It can be divided in internal perceived legitimacy (perception of legitimacy of the process within the randomly-selected group of participants) or external perceived legitimacy (political bodies, main stakeholders, general population). It assesses fairness and quality of the deliberation, and how they resonate with the wider public. It can also be derived from the assessment of the effects of participating in a deliberative space (Mansbridge, 2019).</p>	<p>1. <b>Input legitimacy:</b> It is concerned with high quality deliberation, equality, and equity. It assesses whether the decision-making process reflects ‘the will of the people’ (Pogrebinschi and Ryan, 2017).</p> <p>2. <b>Throughput legitimacy:</b> It is a normative concept and procedural criterion concerned with the governance of the mini-public. It assesses accountability, transparency, openness, and inclusiveness (Schmidt &amp; Wood, 2019).</p> <p>3. <b>Output legitimacy:</b> It is concerned with externally driven, non-procedural and outcome-based elements. It assesses whether the decisions taken during the process achieve policy outcomes and actually respond to the problems of the different public spheres (Strebel et al. 2019; Scharpf, 2003; Pogrebinschi and Ryan, 2017).</p>	<p>1. <b>External legitimacy:</b> It is concerned with the legitimacy of the process for the communities who will be affected by the decisions taken or by its translation into policy (Jacobs and Kaufmann, 2019).</p> <p>2. <b>Internal legitimacy:</b> It is concerned with the legitimacy of the process for the randomly-selected group of people involved in the deliberation (Jacobs and Kaufmann, 2019).</p>

## Annex 2 Guiding questions for the semi-structured interviews and desk research

### *Interview questions:*

1. How would you define legitimacy and resonance of CA assembly?
2. What are the factors that are likely to shape perceptions of legitimacy and resonance?
3. Has legitimacy been considered/discussed in the design of the assembly?
  - How did you plan for enhancing resonance and public communication and engagement around the assembly?
  - How has it been considered in the internal design process (selection, expertise called)?
  - Has it been considered in the external communications and how?
4. How was communication handled:
  - Who was in charge?
  - What was the role of professional PR agencies?
  - What information has been communicated and at what points (live versus later)?
  - What were the key multipliers?
  - Ambassadors/speakers for the assembly?
5. What actions are taken in relation to assemblies to try and maximise legitimacy and resonance, and how effective are they?
6. Has the strategy been effective: were the objectives around legitimacy and resonance achieved? What would you have done differently?
7. Are there different strategies for gaining legitimacy and resonance among the political actors and general public?

### *Supplementary desk research questions*

- Governance arrangements to ensure legitimacy- what is stated publicly?
- How transparent has been the process around the CA (e.g. how much information was shared on the selection, choice of inputs, governance, funding)?
- Dedicated communication channel:
  - Is there a dedicated website?
  - How often is the information on the assembly updated?
  - What type of information is published and at what points?
  - Is there opportunity for submission of inputs from outside?
- Proactive media outreach
  - Were there dedicated media briefings and press releases?
  - What was their frequency?
  - Who are the key people cited/spokespeople for CA highlighted?
- Has there been a proactive media engagement (spokespersons/ambassadors of the CA)? Who are they?
- How much attention has the CA received in the media (and political debate, e.g. in the parliament?) and what was the coverage positive or critical (use media coverage and potentially parliamentary debate as a proxy for CA's resonance)?