

Key learnings

KNOCA Learning Call on Finland's Citizens' Jury on Climate Actions, 24 January 2022

Participants

Panel: Katariina Kulha and Maija Setälä, University of Turku (organisers); Heta-Elena Heiskanen, Ministry of the Environment (commissioner)

Invited respondents: Jaana Sorvali, Natural Resources Institute, Finland; Kaisa Schmidt-Thomé, Demos Helsinki, Linn Davis, Healthy Democracy, USA; Pete Bryant, Shared Future, UK

Task of Jury

Assess the fairness and impact of 14 potential measures to be included in the medium-term Climate Change Policy Plan.

Learnings

- While the Jury shares similarities with other assemblies – civic lottery, honorarium, facilitated learning and deliberation, collective writing of recommendations – it has important differences:
 1. The proposals it considered were policy proposals by government rather than those generated by members of the Jury themselves
 2. Jury members were tasked with appraising the fairness and impact of these proposals
 3. The Jury recommendations fed into a defined policy planning process (c.f. Denmark's Climate Assembly)
 4. The Jury was relatively small (33 members) and very short (3 days)
- Finland has well developed mechanisms for consultation with sectoral interests and different publics. Political elites are not familiar with citizens' assemblies and generally do not see the need for such input.
- The organisers were influenced by the [Citizens' Initiative Review](#) process developed in Oregon where citizens assess the pros and cons of an initiative proposal.
- The design was a compromise between the government's desire for the Jury to assess more policies and the organisers' desire to ensure time for deliberation and recommendation writing. Jury proceedings were a bit rushed – more time was needed for learning and collective writing of recommendations.
- Publicity and awareness of the wider population was not actively sought as part of the process.
- The recommendations of the Jury were similar to the results of other forms of public engagement but had the advantage of providing reasoning to explain members' positions. These were useful insights for government officials and sectoral interests.
- While Jury members were tasked with assessing fairness and impact, their recommendations included ideas on how to improve the policy proposals.
- The lack of opportunity for members to generate their own proposals and the limited time for deliberation reduces the potential to develop more creative and challenging outputs. Concerns were raised that this kind of process could be used to legitimise government policy.

[KNOCA summary of Finland's Jury process](#)

[KNOCA Learning Call video](#)

[Final report of Finland's Jury \(in English\)](#)

[Join our LinkedIn discussion](#)

[Follow us on Twitter @KNOCA EU](#)