



World Library and Information Congress: 70th IFLA General Conference and Council

22-27 August 2004
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Programme: <http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla70/prog04.htm>

Code Number: 107-E
Meeting: 73. Library and Research Services for Parliaments
Simultaneous Interpretation: Yes

Methodology supporting political decision-making in democracy from parliamentary libraries

Ana María Pino Yáñez
Librarian
National Congress Library
Chile



BIBLIOTECA DEL
CONGRESO NACIONAL DE CHILE

CONTENTS

I.-	BACKGROUND.....	4
II.-	INTRODUCTION.....	5
III.-	GENERAL AIMS OF CITIZEN CONSENSUS CONFERENCES.....	7
IV.-	DEVELOPMENT OF CITIZEN CONSENSUS CONFERENCES IN CHILE.....	7
1.-	CITIZEN PANEL SELECTION.....	8
1.1	Way of Calling for Participation.....	8
1.2	Results of Calling for Participation	9
1.3	Selection Process.....	9
2.-	EXPERT PANEL SELECTION.....	10
3.-	COMMUNICATIONAL STRATEGY.....	11
4.-	FACILITATOR SELECTION.....	11
5.-	FIRST WEEKEND MEETING WITH THE CITIZEN PANEL (OCTOBER 3-5, 2003).....	11
6.-	SECOND WEEKEND MEETING WITH THE CITIZEN PANEL (OCTOBER 24-26, 2003).....	12

7.-	CONFERENCE OF THE CITIZEN CONSENSUS (NOVEMBER 22-24, 2003).....	13
8.-	ASSESSMENT OF THE CITIZEN CONSENSUS CONFERENCE	14
8.1.	Strengths.....	14
8.2.	Weaknesses.....	14
9.-	RESULTS AND IMPACTS ON THE PROJECT	15
9.1.	Impact on the Citizen Panel.....	15
9.2.	Impact on the Expert Group	15
9.3.	Impact on the CCC Technical Team.....	16
9.4.	Impact on the Members of the Parliament	16
9.5.	Impact on the Government and Public Institutions.....	17
9.6.	Impact on the Community.....	17
10.-	MONITORING	18
V.-	CONCLUSIONS.....	19
	Assessment level.....	19
	Calling for participation level.....	19
	Citizenship Spreading level.....	19
	Supportive Material level.....	20
	Citizen Panel level.....	20
	Expert level.....	22
	Media level.....	23
	Topic level.....	23
	Institutional level.....	23
VI.-	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	24
	Assessment level.....	24
	Calling level.....	24
	Citizenship Spreading level.....	24
	Topic Information level.....	24
APPENDIX 1.....	25
	Selected Citizen Nominee.....	26
APPENDIX 2.....	27
	CCC Expenses.....	28

I.- BACKGROUND

In today's world, Libraries are shared areas with multiple relationships and great flexibility, in which dialogue with the different actors making up the society is favored, with libraries playing the role of Facilitator in the democratization of knowledge.

From this point of view, the Parliamentary Library allows legislators to expand their range of possibilities, thus requiring the Library to make shifts in its relationship dynamics and traditional services, in response to a different interpretation of what its users are.

The Institution then harmonizes itself with change and operates as a connection network, creating opportunities, emerging as a link between the citizens and political power, and producing shared actions.

The new strategic design of the Library of the National Congress of Chile, which promotes collective activities going beyond the borders of the bookshelves, books and information, includes a participatory methodology, namely, Citizen Consensus Conferences.

This proposal is valuable because it is developed in an inter-institutional field. It considers the diversity of society in the selection of the Citizen Panel, and involves multidisciplinary knowledge of the Expert Panel, as well.

This experience, created in Denmark and applied in Chile according to a model that has the essence of the methodology, took on its own dynamics and manifestations. Thus, we can say that all the Conferences held around the world have had a stamp of national identity.

II.- INTRODUCTION

¹Ana María Pino Yáñez

¿What does ‘Consensus’ mean?

The Royal Academy of the Spanish Language Dictionary defines *consensus* as an “Agreement achieved by the consent of all the members of a group or several groups”. However, there are other definitions given by authors who work with participatory methodologies and who relate this concept to a process of personal transformation in order to achieve fairer and more human ways of dealing with others, working and making decisions, as Paola Willis (Mexico) explains; or as a process looking for balance in power relationships, respect for diversity, and decision-making which can be supported by all involved parties, as Beatrice Briggs (USA/Mexico) maintains.

¿What is a Citizen Consensus Conference (CCC)?

The Consensus Conference is a method of technological assessment, in which a dialogue among the citizens, experts and political power is developed. A Citizen Panel, after being informed, debates and drafts a document used as input in the decision-making.

This participatory methodology is a valuable instrument that uses a very powerful notion for the democratization of knowledge and communication between the Political Power and the Citizens, i.e. “*Informed Consensus*”. Its main characteristics are:

- respect for diversity;
- collective;
- pluralist;
- transparent;
- neutral;
- participatory.

¹ Ana María Pino Yáñez, Librarian, National Congress Library, ‘Conference of Civic Consensus’ Project Head.

It was implemented by the Danish Board of Technology (DBT) in 1986. This organization was created by the Congress of Denmark in order to sound Citizen opinion in the event of technological interventions with impact on the life of the people.

CCCs have been held in more than twenty countries, including Austria, England, Norway, Japan, on several topics, for example: food radiation, infertility treatments, and teleworks.

The method is based on an interchange of knowledge and opinions between a Citizen Panel and an Expert Group, the latter providing multidisciplinary expertise and different points of view about the selected topic.

In topic selection, the following characteristics must be considered:

- the topic must represent the needs of the target group;
- must be controversial and precise;
- must require the contribution of experts;
- must have ethical components, and impact on the institutional or legislative framework.

In the course of the Citizen Consensus Conference, three meetings are held, in which active involvement of the citizens selected for the Panel is required, along with the project Head, who is in charge of the organization, and the Facilitator, who has to further the work in groups by means of entertainment techniques and group dynamics during the three weekends.

At each Meeting, this group is moved to some place and must stay there all weekend, deliberating on the chosen topic, posing questions to the experts, checking the information for the elaboration of the final document that will be passed on to the political Authorities in the closing ceremony of the 3rd Meeting, which in fact corresponds to the Conference itself.

III.- GENERAL AIMS OF THE CITIZEN CONSENSUS CONFERENCE

- Promoting the citizen involvement
- Democratizing knowledge
- Implementing participatory methodologies, as communication mechanisms in Society, and so strengthening the political process
- Introducing informed and consensus-based citizen opinion into the decision-making with regard to public policies.
- Making citizen, scientific community and political power dialogue possible.
- Introduce citizen opinion into the law-making process.

IV.- DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITIZEN CONSENSUS CONFERENCE IN CHILE

It was held for the first in Chile and Latin America during October and November of 2003. It was sponsored by the Pan-American Health Organization (PAHO), and supported by the National Congress, the Health Department and the National Technological and Scientific Investigation Commission (CONICYT, *Comisión Nacional de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica*) which constituted the Steering Committee in charge of the process, along with

the Library of the National Congress, that also had the responsibility of organizing and managing the Conference.

An Understanding Protocol was signed by the Health Department, the Senate of Republic of Chile, the Chamber of Deputies, and CONICYT.

The topic selected was: “the management of my unique health clinical record”, after analyzing the different issues proposed by the Health Department and the Health Commissions of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies of Chile. The topic of the clinical record was considered appropriate because:

- it had a technical component, given that it was necessary to choose a technological framework for the health system reform;
- it included technology and expertise, but it was necessary to make decisions about the viability of the project in the Chilean reality;
- it was relevant socially, for it was in line with the concept of electronic government as an instrument of the future of the modernization of the State;
- it was necessary to create a debate among citizens about the advantages and risks of the unique clinical record: the rights and duties of the citizens, cost-effectiveness of the system, right to the privacy, etc;
- it was necessary to create a institutional and legislative framework for the implementation of the unique clinical record. The Conference may supply an important input to this emerging legislation;
- it was very important to establish the framework for the unique record as an instrument of citizen empowerment, creating a new relationship between Citizens and the Public Administration.

1.- Citizen Panel Selection

1.1 Way of Calling for Participation

It was established that the selected citizens for the Panel would include people from three regions of the country (Metropolitan Region, and V and VI Regions). The notices for meetings, invitations and registration records were distributed to the Units of Citizen Participation of the Public and Private Health Services. Moreover, information was included on the Web site of the National Congress Library, from where people were invited to participate by answering a registration record.

A sample was sent of 2,000 notices of meeting, invitations and registration records calling for the voluntary participation of those citizens interested in making up the Citizen Panel, and giving information about CCC scope and content. Also, posters about the Conference of Citizen Consensus were distributed in the Town Councils of the corresponding regions (a total of 124 councils).

1.2 Results of Calling for Participation

478 citizens, representatives of the diversity of the Chilean society: ages (from 20 to 65 years old), gender and socio-economic stratum, were registered.

Women	Men	Age range (years old)
40	17	20-30
67	13	31-40
91	35	41-50
117	27	51-60
44	19	61-65
5	3	<u>Over 65</u>
364	114	

76% women and 24% men
(August 18th - September 5th, 2003)

1.3 Selection Process

The Selection Committee was made up of three members of the Steering Committee. Selection was to represent diversity. The criteria used in the selection were gender, age and socio-economic stratum, as determined by the Communes; also comments given by the citizens about the reasons for their participation were considered essential. This last factor introduces a non-scientific element, dependent on the intuition of the Selectors.

16 citizens were selected: only 15 participated in the activity, one of them could not attend for justified personal reasons.

Women	Men	Age	Metropolitan Region	V Region	VI Region
2	2	20-30	3		1
3	1	31-40	3	1	
2	2	41-50	3		1
1		51-60			
1	1	61-65	2		
9	6		12	1	2

60% women and 40% men
80% Metropolitan Region and 20% other regions

2.- Expert Panel Selection

The Steering Committee suggested names of experts for the topic “Clinical Record” from different points of view: informatics, legal, public health, and record users, clinical doctor, ethics and clinic management.

7 experts were selected to elaborate the background paper, which was used as a source of information in the first weekend work of the Citizen Panel.

Work was interdisciplinary. The experts met on several opportunities, before delivering the background paper, to think about together and analyze the different points of view on the issue. Every expert presented his/her approach.

The background paper elaborated by the experts was turned into an informative document for the Citizen Panel by the Department of Studies of the National Congress Library.

3.- Communicational Strategy

A strategy was developed to announce the realization of the Conference, its importance and the conclusions reached. In this context, the general aims were to announce this new concept of citizen involvement, focused on the people, in which the citizenship has a fundamental importance, and to foster the concept “democratization of the information”.

Communications activities were developed, such as interviews, publication of reports, round table discussions with the mass media (press, TV channels and radio).

Other media such as the Information Office of the Subway of Santiago, and Supermarkets were also used.

In the web page of the Congress Library, the site: consensociudadano.bnc.cl, was activated, from where it was possible to make links to all the Institutions involved in the CCC, including information about the Conference, and to spread registration records among the citizens.

4.- Facilitator Selection

The Steering Committee was in charge of selecting the Facilitator. The applicants were to fulfill requirements such as, for example: not knowing the subject in depth, but being professionals with experience in communication, and having pedagogical competences and abilities to promote the work among heterogeneous groups.

5.- First Weekend Meeting with the Citizen Panel (October 3-5, 2003)

In this First Meeting, the 15 citizens and the steering team met in a place near to Santiago city. Every one of them had received a letter which explained every phase of the Conference, the place of meeting and working, and also the background paper elaborated by the Group of Experts on clinical records.

1st day: the activities were aimed at revealing the methodology to the citizens, and at making the knowledge of every panel member and the steering team members easier.

2nd day: the Panel worked on the topic itself. The approaches were defined. Then, the Panel was visited by three experts who answered the doubts aroused after the reading of the background paper.

3rd day: the first intent of consensus was made, and the first questions were outlined. All this was mixed with play activities.

The workshop finished with an assessment by the Citizen Panel.

6.- Second Weekend Meeting with the Citizen Panel (October 24-26, 2003)

In this Second Meeting, CCC philosophy and methodology was recalled.

1st day: the work focused on the reduction of approaches. The different types of questions were explained, for example: open or closed questions, and others. Additional information about the health clinical record to the citizens was provided.

2nd day: exercises with different types of questions about the topic were performed. Then, three experts gave Presentations, which included exchange of ideas. Finally, the elaboration of key questions was undertaken.

3rd day: the second intent at consensus was made. The key questions were explored more fully. The citizen Spokesperson was selected.

The workshop finished with the composition of the Consensus song.

7.- Conference of the Citizen Consensus (November 22-24, 2003)

1st day: the Conference begins with the Talks of the invited lecturers, who have much expertise and come from different institutions (12). This activity was open to the general public, and government authorities were invited, as well as the citizens registered to participate and not selected.

2nd day: in a new meeting with the Lecturers, additional questions remaining from the 1st day were answered, and by the afternoon, the Citizen Panel elaborated the CCC final document.

3rd day: the definitive document was finished, which was then passed on to the authorities in the closing Ceremony, held at the National Congress and attended by members of the Parliament and the Health Ministry. The Citizen Panel played a leading role in the Ceremony, holding the same status as the authorities that make the decisions.

The citizen Spokesperson read the final document, followed by comments by the Health Minister and 2 members of the Parliament representing the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies.

The Ceremony finished with the giving of certificates to the citizens that participated in the Panel.

8.- Assessment of the Citizen Consensus Conference

A post-Conference assessment was made with all the people involved in the process, and it was considered, in general terms, a successful experience.

8.1.- Strengths

- The need of people to participate in the decision-making process was obvious, and although they came from different strata and ages, participants demanded their rights equally.
- It was clear that people awakened. Citizens showed dignity and an increasing security in their performance and opinions.
- In the process, we observed: warmth, ability to hear and to be alert, respect for the human being and the diversity, and satisfaction for the democratization of knowledge and society. Confidence rose, diversity was expressed, not representativeness.
- A feedback process occurred: the experts bringing knowledge received in return more information and knowledge.
- An educative process took place, in which the multidisciplinary work is of great importance.
- The creation of knowledge networks was facilitated.

8.2.- Weaknesses

- Limited participation of the members of Parliament, even though the topic was in process of legislation.
- The document focused only on the option of the electronic record, even though the topic was not framed in that way.
- Scant receptivity by the media for the mass communication of the CCC philosophy, methodology and aims.

9.- Results and Impact of the Project

9.1. - Impact on the Citizen Panel

The Citizen Panel developed a high level of empathy and affectivity among its members, enabling teamwork.

From the beginning, individual commitment to teamwork was present, that reflected a complete understanding of the sense of the Conference: reaching the Consensus.

People learned about the Conference topic and related matters: current legislation, ethical principles, administrative questioning, and role of the health system, among others.

The final Consensus document reflected the points of view of every member of the Citizen Panel.

The empowerment of the Consensus philosophy and re-valuation of diverse knowledge was observed.

A space for discussion and the right to express opinion was recovered. Those who participated felt listened to, respected and dignified.

9.2. - Impact on the Expert Group

The new spaces and forms of discussion and multi-disciplinary work were appreciated by participants.

Feedback on the educational process: both citizens and experts learned something new.

Prejudices were overcome, in the sense of reevaluating lay person knowledge, and highlighting the person's dignity.

There was interest in continuing work on the specific issue of the Conference, forming advisory groups to the Legislature and the Executive.

Motivation and readiness to collaborate in future Conferences.

A background paper was developed, containing the multi-disciplinary approaches of experts on the topic Health Clinical Record.

Various documents were issued, including the opinion of the expert lecturers participating in the CCC.

9.3.- Impact on the CCC Technical Team.

Transference of knowledge and learning of the Consensus methodology and philosophy.

Learning of the diversity of the Citizen Panel, in terms of personal relationships.

Affective commitment with the Citizen Panel, caused for the continuous contact by phone, and sometimes in person, with every citizen, from the beginning of the CCC.

Acquisition of knowledge on the topic discussed in the Conference.

9.4.- Impact on the Members of Parliament

The Conference received the support of the Presidents of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies of the Congress of Chile. The Steering Committee of the CCC was received by the Health Commissions of both legislative bodies, and they showed interest on the methodology and the topic to discuss.

It is worth mentioning that, in general, over and above the initial calling, it was difficult to involve Senators and Deputies in the Citizen Consensus Conference.

At the Closing Ceremony of the CCC, three Senators and one Deputy attended, whose comments showed their great satisfaction with the outcomes of the Conference, and their willingness to take the recommendations proposed in the final document into account.

9.5.- Impact on Government and Public Institutions

By the coordination of three Public Agencies: Health Department, National Congress Library and CONICYT, and an International Organization, PAHO, it was possible to carry out the CCC, sharing both human and financial resources.

Active participation of the Health Secretary in the selection of the topic, in the developing of the Conference, and in the closing ceremony by discussing the citizens' final document.

9.6.- Impact on the Community

The CCC was considered an instance of dialogue, reflection and analysis.

The 476 citizens registered to participate in the Conference account for 25 % of the total of meeting notices.

The average attending public to open panels held during the CCC was about 100 people; they ratified the importance of creating spaces in which the credibility about the making of decisions affecting the community, were validated.

It is possible to estimate that the Community showed interest and motivation in initiatives like this, which is observed in the great amount of e-mails, and national and international phone calls received after the CCC had finished, and also because of the interviews by the mass media.

10.- Monitoring

In order to measure the impact of the CCC, it is necessary to implement a Monitoring Unit, in charge of analyzing the CCC effects on the legislative process, the progresses of the debate on the selected topic, and if some of the recommendations proposed by the Citizen Panel have been incorporated.

In the same way, monitoring of the Citizens Panel in order to measure the impact on their daily life and in the social networks they are in is necessary.

On the media, the spreading of the subject and the philosophy of the CCC must be measured.

As a way of measuring the effect of interaction between the Expert Group and the Legislature, Focus Groups will be created.

Some Members of the Parliament showed interest in maintaining this participatory methodology in regard to other issues.

Members of the Health Commissions of the Chamber of Deputies proposed a 2nd CCC about the Disability issue.

V.- CONCLUSIONS

Assessment level

Prior to the Citizen Consensus Conference, there was no plan for the assessment of the Conference. This methodological lack can be explained mainly by our ignorance and this being the first Conference held in Chile. Nor was there a previous assessment of the working plan, perhaps for the immediacy of the task, in this case, to organize the Conference itself.

Calling for participation level

The calling for participation of the citizens was not totally adequate, because the resources of contacts and potential support from other institutions, both public and private, in the spreading of it prior to the Conference, were not optimized.

It is concluded that the citizen's selection was appropriate, because we avoided the selection of people representative of a group of opinion or experts on the topic. From the first moment, the citizens participating in the panel showed their good disposition to teamwork, and formed themselves with a high level of cohesion, motivation and clear consciousness of the central aim of the Conference.

The representativeness of the group in statistical terms is not significant; however, the diversity of citizens selected, according to age, gender, educational level, occupation, socioeconomic features, political or religious opinions or another, made possible to express the diversity of opinions existing in the country, or at least in the central area.

Citizenship spreading level

The spreading among the citizenship was not optimum, because it was principally limited to spaces (walls, notice boards, etc.) in health institutions, so a broad range of the population did not receive information about the Conference and had no possibility to apply.

It is necessary to bear in mind that the Citizen Panel must be constituted exclusively by volunteers interested on the topic, none of them being an expert on the issue nor a member of an interest group in the field.

Supportive material level

The pre-Conference selection of the material to inform the Citizen Panel was appropriate, because it expressed a wide range of perspectives and points of view to deal with the subject. This aspect of the Conference is of the utmost importance when it comes to guaranteeing the transparency, credibility and truthfulness of the process. The citizens were given a dossier with complementary reading.

Citizen panel level

From the beginning, it was developed a high level of empathy and congeniality among the group members, then the work developed in the team, in such a way that everyone participated. Except for few moments, all citizens always participated and collaborated in the teamwork. This shows the individual commitment to group work, and the understanding of the final aim of the Conference, namely, reaching Consensus.

The first weekend was useful for adjusting the definition and the search for the expert panel for the second weekend, in order to represent the diversity of approaches and to answer the different questions presented by the Citizen Panel. In general, it was possible to answer the Citizen Panel's demands, except in the economic area, which was not covered completely. For example, a Treasury Department representative was needed to participate in the Conference, and the subsequent opinions from the participating citizens show this.

It is considered necessary to stress that the search for experts does not intend to influence the Citizen Panel with any premeditated vision, perspective or point of view. Not influencing citizens to embrace any specific posture is a decisive element from an ethical perspective, but at the same time, this element will be central from an strategic and operating vision, in the sense of carrying out appropriately and correctly all Conferences, and thus expressing in the practice the essence of its philosophy.

From the first moment, all members of the Citizen Panel were adequately trained to be in sessions under pressure (time pressure, media pressure, etc.). An intense and continuous work rate was proposed, with fulfillment of clear and specific objectives, which reinforced the individual and collective motivation, as well as the commitment to work and the achievement of every proposed objective.

It is interesting to mention that disagreements arose more because of form than content, since from the beginning this group had a good disposition at the moment to reach Consensus.

The disagreement was expressed for example, with regard to the use of adequate words to refer to some specific concept, more than in core concepts. The fact of not reaching an agreement on semantic aspects generated discussions, specially the last weekend, which, in turn, made it possible for other subject areas indirectly related with the specific topic of the Conference to emerge, Alternative Medicine, for example, among others.

Reflections on different levels of depth were developed inside the group.

There is no certainty about how well all members of the Citizen Panel acquired the knowledge to communicate appropriately the basic aspects and the details of the problems of the Conference. What is really known is that after the Conference all members of the Citizen Panel expressed themselves, saw their point of view being reflected in the final document, and learned new things, so every member developed significant learning, and realized that listening to the other, respecting his/her point of view, and expressing what one thinks and believes about it, is something necessary to reach a Consensus.

All citizens of the panel would participate again in an experience like this, i.e. the Conference, because it is an experience that makes both human development and the finding of their own personal capabilities possible, and makes it easy to learn new things (learning by doing).

Expert level

The expert selection was carried out on the basis of two criteria: the Steering Committee's suggestions and what was requested by the Citizen Panel during the first weekend. Listening to Citizen Panel suggestions on specific experts was, and must be a central element in this stage of the Conference, since they are the ones who must determine which are the approaches from which most of the doubts and questions emerge. This selection attempted to cover the broadest range of visions and perspectives on the specific topic of the Conference in order to provide citizens with diversity from which to think about the subject.

The panelist's exposition helped citizens to build up their own opinion. Likewise, the Conference could generate dialogue and discussions among the experts, an element absent prior to the Conference. We believe that this element is crucial, as to the process aims, and we highlight the high level of commitment and motivation showed by every panelist.

The Conference could influence the agenda of the participating experts, and after the Conference some non-participating researchers have shown interested in the methodological proposal, the clinical records and future topics. It is still not possible to observe effects of the CCC in this area.

However, the fact of changing the current paradigms is considered outstanding, in which only few people may have access to knowledge and, as a consequence, to the processes of making decisions that affect a silent majority. Remembering a beautiful example presented by an expert when referred to the Conference: "maybe the layman does not know how to build the train, but he definitely knows how he is affected by the fact that the railway goes near his house or not."

Likewise, it is not clear if the Conference motivated researchers to regard citizen opinion as an input to establish priority criteria in their research. What we do know is that this process has just begun.

Media level

There was not enough receptivity from the media in general in order to communicate this experience. The appearance of the Project Manager on a TV Channel had a media and mass impact and generated citizen response.

The Website available is regularly visited, which shows the interest of the community.

Topic level

It is considered that the selected topic may produce scientific discussion and a real or potential interest on the population, because the clinical record and its use affects directly the people, the health system, and the life in community.

It is regarded that the topic of the Conference was adequately selected, since it is a specific, not too abstract, and controversial topic for which it was necessary the assistance of experts to make it clear, and about which there are both the enough knowledge and the available experience.

Institutional level

There is not enough data to verify the influence of the Conference on any decision-making authority (Parliament, Justice, Departments, Post of Defense Counsel, etc.), for this reason we consider it essential to develop monitoring methods.

We have not enough background to measure the Conference influence on of Science and Technology policy making nationwide.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Assessment level

For future Conferences, we recommend that there be an assessment plan adjusted to fit each territory, culture and its specific features, that in turn will help to specify and define more clearly the aims to be achieved, as well as the methodology and techniques to use.

Calling level

It is suggested to make the calling for participation by all the Media, such as the local or national newspapers with significant geographical coverage on the city or country, the television, the radio, posters, fliers, etc.

Citizenship spreading level

It is necessary to have a funding to work out a Communication Strategy.

Topic information level

It is recommended that the additional bibliographic materials be in Spanish language.

APPENDIX 1

Selected Citizen Nominee

Name	Occupation	Region	Town
Ana María Atria Rosselot	Marketing consultant	Metropolitan	Las Condes
Antonio Levio Painemal	Building worker	Metropolitan	Huechuraba
Astrid González Araya	Law student	Metropolitan	Providencia
Gustavo Mejías Valdivieso	Student	Metropolitan	La Florida
Inés Gómez Maturana	Householder	Metropolitan	La Pintana
Jeannette Díaz Rojas	Secretary	Fifth	Catapilco
Johanna Valladares Salazar	Social work student	Metropolitan	Lo Prado
Juan Maureira Aravena	Electromechanic	Metropolitan	Conchali
J. Gonzalo Lohse Arangua	Teacher	Metropolitan	Independencia
Manuel Droguett Pérez	Electronic technician	Sixth	Lo Miranda
María Ayala Carreño	Storekeeper	Metropolitan	La Florida
M ^a Isabel Carmona Hernández	Teacher	Metropolitan	Quilicura
Mario Hernán Muñoz Yáñez	Farmer	Sixth	Rengo
Paola Parraguez Fritz	Designer	Metropolitan	La Reina
Verónica Aburto Belmar	Secretary	Metropolitan	Est. Central

APPENDIX 2

CCC expenses

expense type	Notes	Unit price	citizens	amount	Total	Actual expenses		Increased in value counter party	
						NCL	others	NCL	Others
Prior organization									
Project director	*1	1,200,000		6	7,200,000			7,200,000	
Methodological advisory	*2	2,100,000		1	2,100,000				
Technical team	*3	2,908		64	186,112			186,112	2,100,000
Newspaper advertisements	*4				-				
Posters		277,000		1	277,000		277,000		
Postage		100		2,000	200,000	200,000			
Website design	*5	1,000,000		1	1,000,000			1,000,000	
Communications company	*6	800,000		1	800,000			800,000	
subtotal					11,736,112	200,000	277,000	9,186,112	2,100,000
Weekend meetings									
Facilitator		1,260,000		1	1,260,000		1,260,000		
Transportation costs		36,000		1	36,000	12,000		24,000	
Accommodation costs		7,500	20	7	1,050,000	350,000		700,000	
Food costs		5,000	20	7	700,000	233,333		466,667	
Premises renting		50,000		7	350,000	116,667		233,333	
Coffee break		600	20	7	84,000	28,000		56,000	
subtotal					3,480,000	740,000	2,740,000	-	-
CC Conference									
Premises renting	*7				-				
Data show / sound equipment		25,000		2	50,000	50,000			
Backdrop		7,000		2	14,000	14,000			
Video-recording	*8				-				
Music		45,000		1	45,000	45,000			
Coffee break		600	20	2	24,000	8,000		16,000	
Flower arrangement		17,000		1	17,000	17,000			
subtotal					150,000	134,000	16,000	-	-
General Expenses									
Secretary		500,000		2	1,000,000			1,000,000	
Copy paper and others		100,000		3	300,000			300,000	
subtotal					1,300,000	-	-	1,300,000	-
TOTAL					16,693,112	1,074,000	3,033,000	10,486,112	2,100,000

- *1: The NCL (National Congress Library) provided the Project Director, a Staff Librarian full-time assigned to the project.
- *2: The WHO provided the methodological advisory, the person selected was the expert Laura Zurita.
- *3: The technical team is constituted by employees of the NCL. The above table only shows the overtime assigned to the project.
- *4: Newspaper advertisement is a recommended action, but it was not performed because of the lack of funds.
- *5: The Website of Citizenship Conference was designed internally in the NCL. The Web hosting and domain were not considered, and both account for 125,000.
- *6: The communication company was in charge of spreading the CCC in the media, as a part of its contract with the NCL.
- *7: The Premises renting was provided by the Senate in Santiago.
- *8: Video-recording was provided by the Chamber of Deputies: 3-days recording.