



CARISMAND

Culture And RiSk management in
Man-made And Natural Disasters

H2020-DRS-21-2014

HORIZON 2020 PROGRAMME

Secure societies – Protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens

Collaborative and Support Action

Grant Agreement Number 653748

CARISMAND

**Culture And RiSk management in Man-made And
Natural Disasters**

**WP5 – Design of Citizen Summits, collation & analysis of citizens' attitudes
towards disaster risks; analysis of stakeholder assemblies**

Lead Partner – P2 – UOM

Deliverable 5.1

**Structural design & methodology for
Citizen Summits**

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Horizon 2020 Programme (2014-2020)		
Dissemination Level:		
PU	Public	X
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
EU-RES	Classified Information: RESTREINT UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)	
EU-CON	Classified Information: CONFIDENTIEL UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)	
EU-SEC	Classified Information: SECRET UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)	





Document Version Control:

Document Version Control:		
Version 0.1	Originated by: Sandra Appleby-Arnold, Noellie Brockdorff	On 15/02/2016
Version 0.2	Reviewed by: Celia Callus	On 28/03/2016
Version 0.3	Reviewed by: Jeanne Mifsud Bonnici	On 29/03/2016
Version 0.4	Reviewed by: Gabriele Quinti	On 30/03/2016
Version 0.5	Reviewed by: Natividad Mansilla Ovejero	On 11/04/2016
Version 0.6	Reviewed by: Joe Cannataci/Jeanne Mifsud Bonnici	On 20/04/2016
Version 1.0	Revised by: Sandra Appleby-Arnold, Noellie Brockdorff	On 15/02/2017
Version 1.1	Reviewed by: Natividad Mansilla Ovejero	On 23/03/2017
Version 1.2	Reviewed by:	





Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Background & Rationale	5
3.	Organisation	7
3.1.	Schedule and locations	7
3.2.	Information material	7
3.3.	Venue & technical equipment	8
3.4.	Composition of audience.....	8
4.	Methodology	10
5.	Review of features, methodology & organisation	11
6.	Data protection issues and ethical guidelines.....	13
	Appendix A: Example of a Citizen Summit programme.....	14





1. Introduction

This Deliverable describes the general organisational and methodological design for the six Citizen Summits planned as part of the CARISMAND project. It includes a preliminary time schedule, the locations of summits, participant numbers, the demographic structure of the audience to be representative of the diverse nature of the respective community, and the type and mix of presentations and moderated discussion groups (including the form of media and technologies used for these purposes) that will be used. At the time of writing of this report the first two Citizen Summits have yet to take place. Once the first two Citizen Summits have been completed a review of the features, methodology and organisation will be undertaken and, if necessary, the design contained in this document may be adapted for Citizen Summits III & IV scheduled to take place in year two. Similarly, the design for Citizen Summits V & VI scheduled for year three will be modified if necessary following lessons learnt in the previous years. Any changes in structural design and/or methodology applied to the Citizen Summits will be reported via an updated version of this document.¹

¹ At the time of re-submitting this document, the first two Citizen Summits have been held, and the respective results did not reveal any issues that would require any changes or amendments of the next round of Citizen Summits' structural design and/or methodology.





2. Background & Rationale

Citizen Summits were, originally, designed in the political sector to build upon the traditional model of public hearings, but using small discussion groups and interactive computer technologies to place pre-defined discussion topics as well as real-time questions to these groups and display their discussion results and individual votes on large screens to all summit participants. This model, intended to allow “ordinary” citizens rather than only a specialist elite access to the policy-making process, was first used in 2003, when 2,800 residents of Washington DC in what was called an “Electronic town meeting” discussed three city-related issues: better education, improving neighbourhood safety, and creating employment opportunities. The opinions expressed by these citizens were used to develop a “Citywide Strategic Plan”².

Since then, the concept has been taken up by a variety of governmental institutions as well as NGOs to target specific local challenges but, more often, to encourage the public discussion of broader themes such as the future of Europe, climate change, or gender issues. For example, in the past 10 years the Danish Board of Technology Foundation (DBT)³ has organised a number of events that range from citizen summits on the effects of climate change in Danish municipalities specifically prone to flooding⁴, to large-scale citizen meetings taking place in various European countries about privacy and data protection in research projects⁵. Beyond the aim to explore citizens’ political priorities and inform policy makers about alternatives of action, the concept of citizen summits has also been turned into a scientific research design, using tools of quantitative and qualitative methodologies (e.g., transcription and content analysis of groups discussions) to test theoretical models.⁶

The CARISMAND Citizen Summits will combine public information, comprehensive feedback-gathering and data analysis with the results feeding directly into the issues to be discussed in the next Stakeholder Assembly. The results of the Stakeholder Assembly will, in turn, feed into the design of the next round of Citizen Summits. These CARISMAND Citizen Summits go beyond the concept of the Citizen Summits described above – whether those focussing on public participation or those focussing on knowledge generation. Rather than being one-off events,

² Holzer, Marc / Schwester, Richard W. (2016) *Public Administration. An introduction*, Routledge: Abingdon / New York, 363.

³ <http://www.tekno.dk>

⁴ Irwin, Alan / Horst, Maja (2016) *Engaging in a decentred world. Overflows, ambiguities, and the governance of climate change*. In: Chilvers, Jason / Kearnes, Matthew (eds) *Remaking Participation. Science, environment and emergent publics*, Routledge: Abingdon / New York, 64-80.

⁵ Human Brain Project citizen meetings on privacy and data protection in research; <http://www.tekno.dk/article/citizen-meetings-in-the-human-brain-project/?lang=en>; accessed 03/2016.

⁶ Degli Esposti, Sara / Santiago Gomez, Elvira (2015) *Acceptable Surveillance-Orientated Security Technologies: Insights from the SurPRISE Project*. In: *Surveillance & Society* 13(3/4): 437-454.





CARISMAND Citizen Summits will allow citizens across Europe to influence the progression of ideas and, ultimately, shape the development of the CARISMAND toolkit in an iterative process over a period of three years.





3. Organisation

3.1. Schedule and locations

There will be six Citizen Summits organised over the project's 3-year life cycle with the following (preliminary) time schedule and locations:

	Date	Location
Citizen Summit I	July 9 th , 2016	Bucharest
Citizen Summit II	July 16 th , 2016	Malta
Citizen Summit III	June 2017	Italy (Rome or Florence)
Citizen Summit IV	June 2017	Tbd
Citizen Summit V	May 2018	Lisbon
Citizen Summit VI	May 2018	Tbd

The locations chosen for Summits I, III and V are the same as the ones for the Stakeholder Assemblies which take place 3 months prior to the CARISMAND Citizen Summits in the respective year. By doing so, it will be possible to **compare different perspectives and risk perceptions** from both “sides” (citizens and disaster managers) in the same cultural setting. At the same time, Citizen Summits II, IV and VI will allow the **use of culture/s as a tool** for analysis through contrasting findings of summits held in different locations.

The duration of each Citizen Summit will be approximately 5-6 hours and, in order to allow citizens to participate without the need to take any leave from work and minimize interference with religious duties or family-related events, they will take place on Saturdays.⁷

3.2. Information material

Participants in all Citizen Summits will receive a custom-made CARISMAND folder which contains:

- Information material about the project in general;
- Information about each Work Package (summarised results of relevant Work Packages, i.e. WPs 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8⁸, and a short summary of the WP9 “cultural map”); this

⁷ The exact time schedule may vary according to local culture (e.g. customary duration of lunch breaks; early/late dinner times; shop opening hours) in the respective country where a Citizen Summit takes place.





information will “evolve” during the course of the project alongside the respective WP findings);

- Information about each event (Stakeholder Assembly, Citizen Summit) that has taken place previously, summarising the respective results.

Accordingly, the material provided in this CARISMAND folder will be enhanced and updated with every event, following the same iterative principle as the overall organisation of CARISMAND events⁹.

3.3. Venue & technical equipment

The chosen venue will be large enough to host an audience of at least 125¹⁰ people (large meeting room with conference style seating plus a speakers’ panel; several breakout rooms with seating arrangements for 10-12 discussion groups). There will be at least two breaks, and participants will be provided with snacks and refreshments. The venue will be equipped with:

- An audio/video system for presentations;
- Individual audio recording systems for the discussions held simultaneously on each of the 10-12 discussion group tables;
- An audio (or video) streaming system that will allow the organisers (e.g. WP5 and WP9 coordinators) to follow the moderated discussions¹¹;
- A wireless audience response system with voting keypads (“clickers”) for each participant. This system will allow for the posing questions to the audience and to gather their immediate response. These responses are wirelessly transferred to a central unit (e.g., laptop) and results can be immediately displayed via a data projector.¹²

3.4. Composition of audience

Local research agencies will be used for recruiting participants for the Citizen Summits. Depending on the local conditions and local practice, participants may receive a compensation for their time spent at the Citizen Summit (e.g., gift vouchers for local shops). Individuals who are interested in participating will be asked to fill out a recruitment questionnaire to ensure that

⁸ WP2: Actors, systems, processes, policies; WP3: Cultural factors & technologies; WP4: Risk perception & “risk cultures”; WP6: Citizens’ rights; WP7: Citizen empowerment; WP8: Risk communication & the role of the media.

⁹ These CARISMAND folders will also be distributed to participants of all Stakeholder Assemblies.

¹⁰ Approximately 100 participants plus 20-25 organisers (WP coordinators, keynote speakers, moderators etc).

¹¹ Given that all Citizen Summits will be held in the local language, simultaneous interpreters may be hired for this purpose.

¹² For such audience response system, see for example <http://www.clikapad.com>





citizens of all ages, gender and education level are represented.¹³ Whilst the envisaged number of 100 participants per Citizen Summit¹⁴ will not allow for demographic representation in a statistical sense, CARISMAND will strive to give a say to as wide a range of attitudes and perceptions as possible. The recruitment questionnaire will, thus, also seek to determine aspects such as

- knowledge of local disaster management guidelines and practices;
- actual experience of disasters (own experience or experience of a close friend or family member);
- whether living in an area perceived as being specifically prone to disasters;
- knowing of other people (individuals or groups) who are perceived as particularly vulnerable or exposed to disasters;
- usage of social media;
- whether working as a volunteer in a community or self-help group.¹⁵

At the same time, though, it will be ensured that the selected participants are not experts in the field (e.g., disaster managers or practitioners) as the views of experts (citizens included) are being sought during Stakeholder Assemblies.

¹³ Age and gender distribution will be defined based on the respective country's most recent Eurostat figures available (population 18+ years old).

¹⁴ There will be approximately 125 citizens invited to cover an approximate no-show rate of 20%.

¹⁵ These factors are only indicative and may be extended/adapted according to the findings from Stakeholder Assemblies.





4. Methodology

CARISMAND will apply sound scientific methods to analyse the citizens' responses and discussions to ensure that all findings accurately reflect the views of the participants. These analyses explicitly are **not** for the purpose of testing any pre-defined hypotheses or theories. Instead, the analysis of the CARISMAND Citizen Summits will have a strong exploratory character, given that "culture" is a construct which is linked to highly dynamic processes such as social and environmental changes, or media development, at both micro and macro levels. At the same time, "culture" plays an important role in shaping individual as well as collective identities and, therefore, requires sensitive "handling" in any public sphere. Accordingly, it will be imperative to allow citizens to explore their own understanding and identification of cultural groups whilst professional moderators are guiding the discussion beyond basic definitions based on demographic characteristics. Such exploration which seeks to incorporate both the destabilising and the stabilising effects of culture – "cultural change" and "cultural identity" – will best employ **qualitative** methodology.

On the other hand, the cognitive and emotional components related to disaster risk perception can be best explored by using **quantitative** methods, e.g., regarding the frequency and intensity of different types of perceived risk. Although so far predominantly tested via retrospective surveys rather than immediate response systems, such measures will provide a sound foundation for the more "fluid" cultural factors that may shape citizens' risk behaviour in disaster situations.

Accordingly, the first part of each Citizen Summit will consist of a combination of presentations, showing videos and/or pictures, posing questions to the entire audience of participants, measuring their response and providing immediate feedback.

In the second part of each summit, the audience will be split up into smaller groups of about 10 participants. These groups will be guided by a professional moderator and will discuss topics related to cultural aspects. The discussions will be recorded and analysed after the event. However, through voice (or video) streaming the WP5 and WP9 coordinators will be able to listen to the parallel discussions and pose additional questions that may arise, to which participants in discussion groups can answer via their keypads.

In the end, there will be a concluding presentation which summarises the preliminary results of the summit gathered in real-time.





5. Review of features, methodology & organisation

Once the first two Citizen Summits in 2016 have been held, the WP5 leaders will review whether

- (a) features/content have met the participating citizens' expectations;
- (b) the methodology has produced high-quality data;
- (c) the overall organisation has provided an adequate framework; and
- (d) there are any logistical issues that need to be addressed.

To evaluate **features/content** (a), the participating citizens will be asked to fill in a (voluntary) feedback form¹⁶ prepared by the WP11 Internal Evaluation team. This feedback form is envisaged to ask the participants in particular:

- how interesting in general they found the topics presented and discussed;
- whether the topics raised during the Citizen Summit have changed the way they feel about the risk of disasters in the area where they live;
- whether the topics raised during the Citizen Summit have changed the way they may act in case of a disaster;
- whether the topics discussed in the group sessions have raised their awareness of cultural issues in disaster situations; and
- which were the strong and the weak points of the Summit.

The responses will be analysed and reported by the WP11 team to ensure an independent evaluation. To consider the result as satisfactory it should demonstrate that a majority of the participants gave generally positive feedback; additionally, it should provide evidence that the topics addressed during the Summit have raised the participating citizens' awareness and encourage behavioural change¹⁷.

Whether the chosen **methodology** (b) for the Citizen Summits is adequate will be revealed when analysing the data collected via the audience response system during presentations to the general audience and the recordings of the group discussions. The review of the responses during the presentations to the general audience will be focussed on:

- whether an acceptable proportion of participants (at least 80%) actually used the keypad to answer the questions posed to the general audience;

¹⁶ Quantitative questionnaire with answer options based on a 5-point Likert scale as well as text fields that allow, additionally, open answers and comments.

¹⁷ Mean result of at least 3.0 on the 5-point Likert scale.





- whether participants reported any technical difficulties in using the keypad for providing answers, either in person during the event or in writing via the abovementioned feedback form; and
- whether the WP5 team encountered any technical difficulties in using the audience response system in real-time.

A review of the coding process and analyses of the recorded and transcribed/translated group discussions will reveal whether:

- the wording of questions in the discussion guideline and the provided visual cues encouraged and allowed participants to discuss the topics as intended; and
- the moderators encouraged all participants to express their opinions and, whilst allowing controversial arguments, facilitated and achieved a balanced discussion¹⁸.

If the review of the presentations to the general audience and the group discussions reveals any data quality issues or other shortcomings this will be reported in the respective WP5 Deliverables, i.e. D5.3 for the 1st Citizen Summit and D5.4 for the 2nd Citizen Summit.

The **quality and adequacy of the overall organisation** (c) and (d) will be assessed through a debriefing meeting with all members of the organising team (LIBRe, NUTC, UOM) immediately after the event. In this meeting topics to be discussed will include:

- whether the overall time schedule allowed sufficient time for participant registration, coffee/lunch breaks, moving participants between main room and breakout rooms etc.;
- whether the venue itself provided the expected quality, e.g. seating arrangements, lighting, sound-proofing, communication with venue staff;
- specific logistics issues such as staffing of the reception/information desk with native speakers and related procedures (participant registration, distribution and collection of keypads etc.); and
- any other organisational/logistical issues team members may have come across during the course of the event.

If any of the abovementioned topics require changes or amendments to the Citizen Summits' structural design and/or methodology, this will be reported via an updated version of this document (D5.1).¹⁹

¹⁸ Moderators receive the discussion guidelines in both English and the local language at least 2 weeks before the event in order to prepare themselves. Additionally, a moderators briefing will be held at least 1-2 days before the event to clarify any organisational and/or content-related issues.

¹⁹ At the time of re-submitting this document, the first two Citizen Summits have been held, and the respective results did not reveal any issues that would require any changes or amendments of the next round of Citizen Summits' structural design and/or methodology.





6. Data protection issues and ethical guidelines

All participants will be asked to sign a consent form which will provide basic information about the event, i.e., that it is part of CARISMAND, a collaborative project co-funded by the European Union under the Horizon2020 programme that aims to understand the relationships between culture and risk perception in disaster preparedness, management and recovery. They will be informed that their answers will be anonymous, stored in a dedicated database, and that all data will only be shared with project members or other interested parties within the scientific community for scientific or policy publications related to this project. Furthermore, it will be outlined that results from the Citizen Summit may be used to prepare briefings for CARISMAND Stakeholder Assemblies and other CARISMAND Citizen Summits, and that they will also be published on the CARISMAND website.

This consent form will be submitted for approval to the University of Malta's Research Ethics Committee (UREC), which has the delegated authority from the Malta Data Protection Commissioner on matters relating to Data Protection in Malta. This UREC proposal will also include a full description of the Citizen Summits' methodology and content (e.g., questionnaires, discussion guidelines, recruitment letters). Accordingly, all procedures will adhere to the University of Malta's ethical principles as well as the Malta Data Protection Act, 2001. Additionally, local data protection requirements of the countries where the Citizen Summits are carried out will also be fully adhered to. The full documentation on ethics clearance will be reported and documented in D5.2. In case that, following the review described in section 5, methodology and/or content of Citizen Summits 3-6 are amended or altered, this will be comprehensively addressed in a new UREC proposal and approval will be sought accordingly. Again, the full documentation of this process will be reported in an update/amendment to Deliverable D5.2.





Appendix A: Example of a Citizen Summit programme

As an example²⁰, the content of a CARISMAND Citizen Summit may look as follows:

Welcome of participants and introduction of the CARISMAND project

Logistics brief and information about personal data protection

Part I:

- Collection of demographic data via audience response system
- Measurement of the audience's risk perceptions²¹ (*before* knowledge provision)
- Presentation by an expert about disaster management procedures in the respective country/locality where the summit takes place
- Measurement of the audience's risk perceptions (*after* knowledge provision)
- Presenting photos/videos related to **recent** local incident²²
- Measurement of the audience's risk perceptions (after visual cues)
- Presentation by expert about disaster preparedness, e.g. via the usage of social media
- Measurement of perceptions related to disaster preparedness (of oneself, and of "others"²³)

Part II:

- Introduction of moderators and discussion principles
- Moderated discussion of a set of questions²⁴, e.g. related to
 - o The participants' perceived level of knowledge about
 - (a) Disaster risks
 - (b) Disaster preparedness measures
 - o Who are the people who are most affected by (different types of) disasters, and what do the participants think are these people's specific needs (⇒ identification of cultural groups)

²⁰ A detailed definition of content for each Citizen Summit will only be possible once the respective preceding CARISMAND Stakeholder Assembly has taken place.

²¹ For example risk perceptions related to disaster type and level of perceived risk.

²² For example, this could be about the nightclub fire in Bucharest on 30/10/2015 costing 64 lives and with 147 injured. In Malta, a panic in a nightclub on 14/11/2015 left 74 injured with the majority being minors. In both cases, the disasters can be categorised a man-made.

²³ These "others" provide the link to the second part of the Citizen Summit, as these may be the cultural groups that CARISMAND is seeking to identify.

²⁴ A detailed set of discussion guidelines will be prepared and translated into the respective local languages.





- Identification of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the participants' communities in case of a disaster
- Scope for improvement through the involvement of cultural groups.

Conclusion (including provision of feedback on real-time results from audience response system)

