

Evaluation Questionnaires for Citizens' Assemblies: Organisers and Participants

Note on publication and authorship

The Federation for Innovation in Democracy (FIDE) drafted this document in 2025 and retains full authorship of it. Deliberativa publishes it with FIDE's permission so that this methodological resource can circulate among practitioners, institutions, and researchers working on the evaluation of Citizens' Assemblies, especially in relation to process design, participant experience, follow-up, and institutional learning. Its public release through Deliberativa should therefore be read as an act of circulation, not co-authorship. Everything that follows this note, including the document's architecture, wording, scope, and methodological assumptions, remains entirely FIDE's.

Methodological disclaimer

The two enclosed questionnaires were developed to evaluate deliberative processes, specifically focussing on citizens' assemblies.¹ The questionnaires for organisers and participants are designed to assess the process design and participants' deliberative experiences, as well as overall satisfaction with the citizens' assembly. Both questionnaires are available in a longer and a minimal version (consisting of a proposal for data collection).

Three versions of questionnaires for organisers have been drafted, to be used to interview officials from the commissioning authority of the deliberative process, process facilitators or politicians involved. We have designed these questionnaires to contain about 30 % fewer questions than the well-known OECD questionnaire, so that they are easier to use and can be completed with fewer resources.

For the evaluation of the participant experience, we suggest two surveys: a pre-assembly survey, before the deliberative process begins, and a post-assembly survey after the process has ended. Conducting a survey before the process begins allows for the collection of baseline data on participants' initial attitudes, knowledge, and expectations. A pre-assembly survey can reveal participants' initial concerns or uncertainties about the process. This information can guide officials and facilitators in addressing these issues proactively, ensuring that the assembly is better tailored to participants' needs. A post-assembly survey provides direct feedback on the participants' experiences, capturing how well the process met its goals, how participants perceived their contributions, and whether their expectations were fulfilled.

¹ The proposal is mainly informed by the OECD evaluation guidelines, Reuchamps/Caluwaerts (2023) in De Gruyter Handbook of Citizens' Assemblies, Apouey/Fourniau/Tournus (2022) in Participations 2022/3.), Marjan H. Ehsassi's learning agenda for FIDE NA and the evaluation framework of Bureau Burgerberaad. Experts and practitioners in the field and of our advisory and executive board had a significant influence on the adaptation of the questionnaire.

When using this tool for evaluation, it is important to consider the following methodological points:

- **Context:** The results of this questionnaire should be interpreted in light of the specific design and objectives of the citizens' assembly being evaluated. Variations in assembly structure, the complexity of the topics discussed, and participant demographics may influence responses. Depending on the purpose of the evaluation (improving the process for future assemblies, comparing different processes or increasing the transparency and legitimacy of assemblies etc.), the weighting of the results may also differ.
- **Self-Reported Data:** The questionnaire is largely based on self-reported perceptions, which may be subject to individual biases, such as social desirability or memory inaccuracies. To mitigate these effects, and if resources allow, consider combining the data with other evaluation methods (e. g., observations, session recordings).
- **Number of interviews:** To meet the minimum requirements for a comprehensive evaluation of the process, it is recommended that at least **five interviews** be conducted with **organisers** (including officials from the commissioning authority, process facilitators or politicians involved). This sample size allows for a variety of perspectives and ensures that the evaluation captures the complexity and nuances of the deliberative process. However, the final number may vary depending on the context, objectives of the evaluation as well as the accessibility and availability of the interviewees. In order for the survey of the participants to be considered as valid, a response rate of at least **60-70% of the participants** is recommended. This range ensures a robust sample size that reflects the views of the participants while minimizing potential bias. Higher response rates (above 70%) can provide even more confidence in the findings, indicating that the results are representative of the broader group.
- **Sampling limitations:** Ensure that all participants in the citizens' assembly have had an equal opportunity to complete the questionnaire. If possible, allow time for participants to complete the survey during the final session. Please note that if the response rate is low or unrepresentative, the results may not reflect the diversity of participants' experiences.
- **Interpretation of Scales:** The scales used in the questionnaire are designed to capture subjective experiences. Small differences in responses do not always indicate significant differences in participant satisfaction or outcomes but may be due to subjective judgement. Therefore, avoid over-interpreting small changes in scores.
- **Evaluation as a learning process:** The evaluation process may also provide opportunities for various actors to share ideas and learn from each other. This may also lead to joint capacity building.
- **Distinction between follow-up and impact assessment:** The questionnaires at hand include questions on the follow-up of citizens' assemblies, such as whether the commissioning authority has had responded in writing to the citizens' recommendations and whether it has been tracking the implementation process. However, the questionnaires are not designed to measure policy impact, i.e. the extent to which the recommendations have been implemented in the respective policy area, especially since this assessment usually takes several years and requires a complex and sophisticated research design.

- **Transparency:** When publishing the evaluation results, clearly specify the number of interviews and surveys conducted, even if presented in a randomized format or in clustered form. Regarding the results of the organisers' questionnaire indicate which organisers were interviewed and note whether the full political spectrum was represented, and if not, provide the reasons for any gaps in coverage.

Questionnaire for organisers

- Method: semi-directed, open-ended interview with representative of commissioning authority, process facilitator or politician who was involved in the process in one way or another
- The interview should be supplemented by document reviews, etc.
- The data collection listed below is designed to provide an evidence-based and comparative overview of the functioning, inclusion and effectiveness of citizens' assemblies. This data can be collected through interviews or other qualitative or quantitative research methods (depending on the data released by the authorities).

Timeline for the process evaluation:

Immediate Post-assembly evaluation (immediately after the assembly, up to 3 months after the assembly):

Purpose: Evaluation of immediate outcomes, such as the quality of deliberations and recommendations produced.

Importance: Provides insight into the success of the assembly in achieving its objectives and identifies lessons for future initiatives. This is critical to understanding the effectiveness of the assembly's design and implementation. Immediate feedback reduces the risk of recall errors or external factors influencing responses.

Mid-term Evaluation (6 months after the assembly)

Purpose: Evaluation of the preliminary response on the recommendations by the commissioning authority.

Importance: Timely evaluation is important to put the authority's feedback in direct context with the discussions and outcomes of the assembly, which strengthens the public debate on the issue and the participants' sense of contribution. In some cases, it may also give the assembly or parts of it the opportunity to reconvene, react to the authority's response and potentially raise concerns about the response.

Long-term evaluation (results assessment, 12 months and longer after the assembly):

Purpose: Conducted at least one year later to assess the long-term results of the assembly's recommendations on policy and societal outcomes as well as public debate.

Importance: Measures the lasting effects and informs the commissioning authority and the public about the status of implementation of citizens' input.

Data collection

Depending on how much resources are available, this data can be collected through a pre- and/or post-assembly survey. The pre-assembly survey is useful to establish baseline data, set clear objectives and understand the expectations of the commissioning authority, service providers and potentially politicians.

However, if only limited resources are available and only one interview can be conducted, it is recommended to conduct the interview rather after the assembly (immediate post-assembly evaluation), as data on the participation & drop-out rates or on the follow-up are otherwise not yet available.

1. Process Design and Transparency

- Participant selection method: If random selection process, explain sortition method & specify stratification criteria
- Transparency: Availability of documentation (including dedicated online platform for the process), public access to proceedings, live streaming, etc.
- Budget: Total cost of the assembly (including breakdowns by category and sections on internal costs)

2. Governance Structure

- Governance structure set up for organising & operating the process (steering committee, advisory committee, evidence committee etc.)
- Level of government involved

3. Participant Demographics

- Number of participants: Total number of citizens involved.
- Demographic diversity: Representation across age, gender, ethnicity, education, socioeconomic status, etc.
- Criteria for inclusion in the sample (Residents, users, citizens, voters etc.)
- Participation & Drop-Out rate: Percentage of invited participants who accepted, attended, dropped out before the start of the assembly or during the process.

4. Deliberation and Decision-Making

- Number of hours of process: Total duration between first and last meeting.
- Deliberation format: Plenary sessions vs. small group discussions.
- Decision-making process: Consensus, voting, or mixed methods.
- Number of recommendations: Final recommendations produced.
- Agreement rate: Percentage of participants agreeing with final recommendations.

5. Facilitation

- Facilitation ratio: Number of facilitators per participant or per table.
- Type of facilitation: Table facilitation or group facilitation; Professional, external facilitators or organizers

6. Information and Learning

- Number of information sources: Total number of sources (documents, presentations, expert testimonies).
- Types of information sources: Academic studies, governmental reports, expert testimony, public opinion data, etc.
- Expert diversity: Number of experts from different fields and with different perspectives.
- Structure of governance of knowledge management: Assignment & Oversight of responsibilities for organizing, curating, and sharing evidence throughout the process.

7. Response and Follow-up

- Transparent Feedback mechanisms: Publication of final report; Publication of summary documents for wider public; public implementation tracking of recommendations (tables, reports etc.) including timelines for actions, and any barriers to progress
- Face-to-face Discussion of final recommendations with the public authority or other politicians concerned

- Written response of public authority to all final recommendations
- Evaluation of the process: independent body, participant evaluation or internal self-evaluation & open access to evaluation reports

Questionnaire (Organiser: Public official of Commissioning Authority)

Organiser: Personal Experience and Involvement

1. Can you describe your role and responsibilities in organizing this citizens' assembly? (How did your role evolve throughout the process?)
2. Is this your first time organizing a citizens' assembly? If not, how does this experience compare to previous ones?
3. How would you characterize your relationship with the service providers/politicians during the citizens' assembly?
4. To what extent did the service providers/politicians or the higher hierarchy of the commissioning authority support the organization of the assembly?

Process Design: Objectives and Goals

5. What are the primary objectives in organising this process?
6. How were these objectives determined and by whom?
7. How was the mandate and the task established?
8. Were stakeholders involved in the process design and if so, how were they selected?
9. Did the design fulfil the intended purpose?
10. How did the design actually work in practice?
11. Were schedules and costs respected?

Staff and coordination

12. How many part-time/full-time positions were allocated to the project?
13. How did the coordination between the commissioning authority & facilitators work?

Transparency

14. Was the information about the assembly clear and publicly available beforehand? Did you have a website where all meeting summaries, presentations and information materials were published?

Political context

15. Were there any specific political events or developments during the assembly that impacted its proceedings?
 - Yes, please briefly describe the event(s).
 - No
 - Unsure
16. What aspects, if any, of the political context (e.g., election cycles, political leadership, major policy debates, social movements etc.) do you think influenced the citizens' assembly?

Representativeness and equal choice to participate

17. What method and criteria were used for participant selection?
- 17bis. Did you attempt to over-sample from groups particularly prone to self-excluding from participatory processes and, if so, how was that outreach carried out?

18. How did you ensure equal opportunities for all members to participate, including those from marginalised or underrepresented groups? (travel, accommodation, compensation, childcare etc.)

Provision of evidence

19. How was the evidence selected and made available to members before and during the assembly? (including selection of relevant stakeholders for presentations) Who contributed to this selection?

Facilitation and Deliberation

20. What facilitation methods were used during the assembly?
21. Do you think that the members had enough time given the complexity of the task they were given?
22. What methods of deliberation were used during the assembly (e.g. considering underlying values & different perspectives, weighing trade-offs etc.)?

Inclusiveness and Accessibility

23. How did you ensure the process was inclusive and accessible to all members, including those with disabilities or language barriers?
24. Have you received suggestions to adapt parts of the process and if so, have you responded to them?

Follow-up & Results

25. What feedback measures have been taken to ensure that the assembly's recommendations are considered? (e. g. response to final recommendations)
26. How will the assembly's outcomes be measured and reported? (tracking of recommendations (tables, reports etc.) and any barriers to progress)
27. In what ways, if at all, do you think that the political context (e.g., government priorities, political party positions, public opinion) influenced how the decisions and recommendations of the citizens' assembly were considered by policymakers or stakeholders?

Lessons Learned

28. What were the biggest challenges faced during the organisation and execution of the assembly?
29. What key lessons were learned, and (how) will they inform future assemblies?
30. Were there any unexpected outcomes or insights gained from the assembly? Have you made decisions or supported recommendations that you would not have made without holding the citizens' assembly?
31. To what extent did the CA experience change your attitude or opinion on citizens' assemblies?

Questionnaire (Organiser: Service Provider)

Purpose: Service providers often have suggestions for process improvements that may enhance future citizens' assemblies. By soliciting their feedback, practical areas for improvement may be identified, such as better communication, strategies to engage participants, or logistical improvements that were not visible to the commissioning authority or participants.

Organiser: Personal Experience and Involvement

1. Can you describe your role and responsibilities in organizing this citizens' assembly? (How did your role evolve throughout the process?)
2. Is this your first time organizing a citizens' assembly? If not, how does this experience compare to previous ones?
3. How would you characterize your relationship with the commissioning authority during the citizens' assembly?
4. To what extent did you feel supported by the commissioning authority throughout the organization of the assembly?

Process Design: Objectives and Goals

5. What are the primary objectives in organising this process?
6. At what point did you get involved in the design and organisation of the process?
7. How were these objectives determined and by whom?
8. How was the mandate and the task established?
9. Were stakeholders involved in the process design and if so, in what form and what was their contribution?
10. Did the design fulfil the intended purpose?
11. How did the design work in practice?

Staff and coordination

12. How clear were the instructions and guidelines provided to you as an organizer/facilitator before and during the assembly?
13. How did the communication and coordination between you as the service provider and the commissioning authority work?

Logistics

14. How well did the logistical arrangements (venue, materials, schedule) support the facilitation process?
15. Did you feel you had adequate resources (e.g. technology, staff, materials) to fulfil your role as facilitator effectively?

Representativeness and equal choice to participate

16. How did you ensure equal opportunities for all members to participate, including those from marginalised or underrepresented groups? (communication before assembly started etc.)

Provision of evidence

17. How was the evidence selected and made available to members before and during the assembly? (including selection of relevant stakeholders for presentations) Who contributed to this selection?
18. Did the members have enough time to review the materials before and during the assembly?

Facilitation and Deliberation

19. What facilitation methods were used during the assembly?
20. What methods of deliberation were used during the assembly (e.g. considering underlying values & different perspectives, weighing trade-offs etc.)?
21. As a service provider, do you think that the time for deliberation was appropriate for the task set for the citizens' assemblies?
22. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the facilitation process in ensuring that all participants had the opportunity to contribute meaningfully? Scale: 1 (Very Ineffective) to 5 (Very Effective); Please provide examples of what worked well or areas that could be improved
23. How inclusive was the facilitation in terms of engaging participants from diverse backgrounds, with different levels of experience or with disabilities?
24. Were there any participants who faced challenges in engaging fully (e.g., due to language barriers, lack of information, or other issues)?
25. Did you feel that participants were able to adequately reflect on the issue under discussion and reach informed conclusions?

Learning and Reflection

26. Have you received suggestions to adapt parts of the process and if so, have you responded to them?
27. How well did the assembly's structure allow for the incorporation of ongoing feedback from members and facilitators?

Follow-up

28. Have you organized or participated in any follow-up activities to ensure that the assembly's recommendations are considered?
29. What are the key challenges you foresee in taking the recommendations of the citizens' assembly into account?

Lessons Learned

30. What do you consider to be the biggest successes of the facilitation team during this citizens' assembly?
31. What were the biggest challenges faced during the organisation and execution of the assembly?
32. What key lessons were learned, and (how) will they inform future assemblies?
33. Were there any unexpected outcomes or insights gained from the assembly?

Questionnaire (Organiser: Politician)

Purpose: Conducting interviews with politicians who have tasked or participated in a citizens' assembly is crucial for understanding their perspectives on the process and outcomes. These interviews provide insights into the motivations behind initiating the assembly, the expectations set for deliberation, and how the results align with political objectives. [Depending on whether politicians who have had tasked the process are interviewed, some questions need to be adapted.]

Organiser: Personal Experience and Involvement

1. Can you describe your role and responsibilities regarding this citizens' assembly?
2. Is this the first time you have initiated/participated in a citizens' assembly? If not, how does this experience compare to previous ones?
3. Did you feel that politicians had enough opportunity to provide input into the citizens' assemblies process?

Process Design: Objectives and Goals

4. What are the primary objectives and the overall purpose of this process?
5. How were the objectives of this process determined and by whom?

Transparency

6. [If interviewee is not among those responsible for launching the assembly] How transparent and trustworthy did you find the process of the citizens' assembly?

Political context

7. Were there any specific political events or developments during the assembly that impacted its proceedings?
 - Yes, please briefly describe the event(s).
 - No
 - Unsure
8. What aspects, if any, of the political context (e.g., election cycles, political leadership, major policy debates, social movements etc.) do you think influenced the citizens' assembly?

Inclusiveness and Representativeness

9. Did the citizens' assembly reflect a diverse and representative sample of the population?

Provision of evidence

10. Did you have any involvement in the selection and preparation of the evidence made available to members before and during the assembly?

Recommendations

11. Did you have the opportunity to discuss the recommendations with citizens during or after their deliberations?
12. How relevant, informed and balanced do you think the recommendations of the citizens' assembly are? Were the recommendations from the citizens' assembly aligned with current political and policy priorities?

Follow-up and Results

13. Have you participated in any follow-up activities to ensure that the assembly's recommendations are responded to?
14. What are the key challenges you foresee in implementing the recommendations of the citizens' assembly?
15. In what ways, if at all, do you think that the political context (e.g., government priorities, political party positions, public opinion) influenced how the decisions and recommendations of the citizens' assembly were considered by policymakers or stakeholders?

Lessons Learned

16. What improvements would you suggest for future citizens' assemblies (e. g. in terms of engaging political stakeholders)?
17. Would you be likely to support holding more citizens' assemblies on other key policy issues in the future? If yes, on which topics do you think a citizens' assembly could be most useful? And on which level of governance?
18. Were there any unexpected outcomes or insights gained from the assembly? Did you support recommendations or make decisions that you would not have made without the citizens' assembly?

Questionnaire for organiser — Minimum Version

Data collection

1. Process Design and Transparency

- Participant selection method: If random selection process, specify stratification criteria
 - Transparency: Availability of documentation (including dedicated online platform for the process), public access to proceedings, live streaming, etc.
 - Budget: Total cost of the assembly (including breakdowns by category)
-

2. Governance Structure

- Governance structure set up for organising & operating the process (steering committee; advisory committee etc.)
 - Level of government involved
-

3. Participant Demographics

- Number of participants: Total number of citizens involved.
 - Demographic diversity: Representation across age, gender, ethnicity, education, socioeconomic status, etc.
 - Criteria for inclusion in the sample (Residents, users, citizens, voters etc.)
 - Participation & Drop-Out rate: Percentage of invited participants who accepted and attended.
 - Participant compensation: How participants were compensated (e.g., daily stipends, travel expenses).
-

4. Deliberation and Decision-Making

- Number of hours of process: Total duration between first and last meeting.
 - Deliberation format: Plenary sessions vs. small group discussions.
 - Decision-making process: Consensus, voting, or mixed methods.
 - Number of recommendations: Final recommendations produced.
 - Agreement rate: Percentage of participants agreeing with final recommendations.
-

5. Facilitation

- Facilitation ratio: Number of facilitators per participant or per table.
 - Type of facilitation: Table facilitation or group facilitation; Professional, external facilitators or organisers
-

6. Information and Learning

- Number of information sources: Total number of sources (documents, presentations, expert testimonies).
 - Types of information sources: Academic studies, governmental reports, expert testimony, public opinion data, etc.
 - Expert diversity: Number of experts from different fields or perspectives.
-

7. Response and Follow-up

- Face-to-face Discussion of final recommendations with the public authority
- Response of public authority to final recommendations
- Implementation rate: Percentage of recommendations adopted by the relevant authority.
- Evaluation of the process: independent body, participant evaluation or self-evaluation

Proposal for a questionnaire for participants of a citizens' assembly

Note:

- Answers to the questionnaire should be confidential and survey results should be published in clustered form to protect individual responses
- Some of the questions can be asked at the beginning, during and at the end of the process (labelled with this symbol )
- The questionnaire is divided into 'before' and 'after' the citizens' assembly.
- If resources allow and depending on the purpose of the evaluation, the questionnaire could be supplemented by observation, in-depth interviews, (social) media analysis, discourse analysis, media coverage and document review etc.

Personal Information (adaptable depending on case)

How old are you? • Under 18 • 18-24 • 25-34 • 35-44 • 45-54 • 55-65 • 66+
What is your gender identity? • Female • Male • Non-binary • Prefer not to say
What is your highest level of education and your current occupation? Education Level: • Less than High school • High school diploma or equivalent • Vocational training • Some college, no degree • Bachelor's degree • Graduate degree
Occupation: • Entry-level position • Mid-level position • Senior-level position • Self-employed • Not currently employed

Questionnaire before the assembly

Task and design

1. Is the task given to the citizens' assembly clear to you? ()
 - The task was very clear.
 - The task was mostly clear.
 - The task was clear.
 - The task was not clear enough.
 - The task was not clear at all.
 - I don't know.
2. Do you understand how the recommendations you will be working on will be taken up by the commissioning authority? ()
 - Yes, I fully understand what will happen to our recommendations.
 - I have a good understanding of what will happen to our recommendations.
 - I have a general idea of what will happen to our recommendations.
 - I am somewhat unsure about what will happen to our recommendations.
 - No, I do not understand what will happen to our recommendations.

Logistics

3. Have you received sufficient support (e.g., travel reimbursement, childcare, accessibility accommodations) to enable you to participate fully?
 - Yes, I received all the support I needed.
 - Yes, I received most of the support I needed.
 - I received some support, but more was needed. [Please, specify:]
 - I received minimal support and struggled to participate fully. [specify:]
 - No, I did not receive sufficient support to participate fully.
 - Not applicable / I did not need any support.

Concerns

4. Do you have any concerns or fears before attending the citizens' assembly? Please select all that apply.
 - I don't have any major concerns before attending.
 - I am worried I wouldn't have enough knowledge about the topics being discussed.
 - I am concerned that others might judge or criticize my opinions.
 - I am afraid that the discussions or topics might be too complex for me to follow.
 - I am worried about potential disagreements with other participants.
 - I feel unsure about what to expect from the citizens' assembly process.
 - Other [Please specify:] [Open text box]

Motivation

5. What motivates you to participate in the citizens' assembly? Please select all that apply.
- I want to contribute to my community.
 - I am passionate about the topics being discussed.
 - I don't know much about the topic and would like to learn more.
 - I believe my voice can make a difference.
 - I was invited and felt it was important to attend.
 - I am curious about the process.
 - Other [Please specify]: [Open text box]
6. What are your expectations regarding the outcome of the citizens' assembly?
- I don't have any specific expectations.
 - I expect real change will come from the assembly's recommendations.
 - I hope for some impact, but I'm not sure how much will change.
 - I am unsure about the assembly's impact on policy-making or the government.
 - I don't expect significant outcomes but want to participate anyway.
 - I expect to have an exchange with other citizens, but I have no expectations towards policymakers or the government.

Learning

7. How would you rate your level of knowledge about the topic that will be discussed before attending the citizens' assembly?
- I have no knowledge of the topic.
 - I have a basic understanding of the topic.
 - I have a moderate understanding of the topic.
 - I have a strong understanding of the topic.
 - I consider myself very knowledgeable about the topic.

Trust and Political Efficacy

8. Please rate on a scale of 0 to 10 how much you personally trust each of the institutions listed, where 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust. ()
- Country's parliament
 - Government
 - Legal System
 - Politicians
 - Political Parties
9. Do you trust in the commitment of the government or the authority holding the citizens' assembly to take your recommendations into account? Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "no trust at all" and 10 means "full trust". ()

Is there anything specific you hope the organizers of the citizens' assembly will address or provide during the event?

Questionnaire after the assembly

Overall experience

1. To what extent, if at all, has it been a good experience to participate in the citizens' assembly?
 - To a great extent
 - To a high extent
 - Moderately
 - To a low extent
 - Not at all
2. Would you recommend others to participate in a citizens' assembly?
 - Yes, definitely
 - Yes, but with some reservations
 - Maybe, depending on the person or topic
 - No, probably not
 - No, definitely not
 - I'm not sure
3. After participating in the citizens' assembly, did you feel more empowered to do any of the following?
 - I do not feel more empowered to engage in political or community activities.
 - Engaging in political discussions with friends, family and colleagues
 - Volunteering for community or political causes
 - Joining or organizing advocacy groups or grassroots movements
 - Voting in local, regional, national or EU elections
 - Campaigning for a political party or candidate
 - Participating in local government or community meetings
 - Running for a public office or local position
 - Supporting or contributing to political campaigns (e.g., donations)
 - Signing petitions or engaging in online activism
 - Other [Please specify] [Textbox]

Task and design

4. Is the task given to the citizens' assembly clear to you? (👉)
 - The task was very clear.
 - The task was mostly clear.
 - The task was clear.
 - The task was not clear enough.
 - The task was not clear at all.
 - I don't know.
5. Do you understand how the recommendations you will be working on will be taken up by the commissioning authority? (👉)
 - Yes, I fully understand what will happen to our recommendations.
 - I have a good understanding of what will happen to our recommendations.
 - I have a general idea of what will happen to our recommendations.

- I am somewhat unsure about what will happen to our recommendations.
 - No, I do not understand what will happen to our recommendations.
 - Yes.
 - Yes, partially.
 - No, I think the process was too short.
 - No, I think the process was too long.
 - I don't know.
6. How would you rate the amount of time you had available to work, given the complexity of the task? Please answer using the scale below:
- 1 = Time was far too short
 - 2 = Time was too short
 - 3 = Time was somewhat short
 - 4 = Time was adequate
 - 5 = Time was somewhat long
 - 6 = Time was too long
 - 7 = Time was far too long
7. How would you have used the extra time? Select all that apply.
- Hearing from more experts
 - Hearing from more stakeholders
 - Spent more time on deliberation before making recommendations
 - Spent more time on developing our recommendations

Influence

8. Did you feel that any of the following put undue pressure on you to take a particular position? If so, please indicate in the textbox, by whom and how you were put under undue pressure. ()
- Experts
 - Facilitators
 - Other members
 - Politicians
 - Civil servants
 - Social Media posts
 - Media reporting
 - Civil society
 - Industry
 - Other (please specify): [Textbox]
 - Not applicable/I did not feel pressured
 - [Textbox: Indicate by whom and how you were put under undue pressure.]

Logistics

9. Have you received sufficient support (e.g., travel reimbursement, childcare, accessibility accommodations) to enable you to participate fully?
- Yes, I received all the support I needed.
 - Yes, I received most of the support I needed.
 - I received some support, but more was needed. [Please, specify:]
 - I received minimal support and struggled to participate fully. [specify:]

- No, I did not receive sufficient support to participate fully.
 - Not applicable / I did not need any support.
10. If there were barriers that made it difficult for you to participate in the meetings, what were they? (select all that apply to you)
- No barriers made it difficult to participate.
 - Barriers related to my personal life (e. g. family commitments)
 - Barriers related to my work (e.g. shift work, busy schedule)
 - Financial barriers (e. g. travelling costs)
 - Meetings took up too much of my time or energy
 - Yes, other barriers: [Please specify]
 - Don't know.

Representativeness

11. Did you have the feeling that there were groups in society that were not present in the assembly? (e. g. age groups, level of education, political orientation, gender, people with a migration background, ethnic or religious minorities, etc.)
- Yes [Please specify:]
 - No
12. How many other members do you think had differing views to yours?
- None
 - A few of them
 - About half of them
 - Most of them
 - I don't know
13. To what extent, if at all, do their views differ from yours?
- They were hardly different
 - They were slightly different
 - They were significantly different
 - They were completely different
 - I don't know

Concerns

14. Did the concerns or fears that you had before you participated in the assembly actually materialise?
- No, I had no concerns or fears before I took part in the citizens' assembly.
 - Yes, in part. [Please specify]

Facilitation

15. How would you rate the facilitators' ability to ensure everyone's voice was heard?
- Very good
 - Good
 - Fair
 - Neutral
 - Poor
 - Very poor

16. To what extent, do you feel that the facilitators were neutral or biased (favouring certain options or offering their opinion)? Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “completely neutral” and 10 means “very biased”
17. Were disagreements between members handled appropriately?
- Always
 - Most of the time
 - Sometimes
 - Never
 - Not applicable/ No conflicts occurred

Relevance of the evidence & stakeholders

18. To what extent do you feel that the information resources provided represented overall balanced and diverse points of view on the issue under discussion? Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “the information base felt very biased and too narrow” and 10 means “the information base felt neutral with a large diversity of sources”
19. Did you find the evidence presented by the speakers easy or hard to understand?
- I understood it from the beginning
 - Initially it was hard to understand, but by the end of the process I understood a lot of it much better
 - I found all of it hard to understand throughout
20. Were you able to request and receive additional information beyond that originally provided by the organisers?
- Yes, additional information was requested and provided
 - Yes, additional information was requested, but it was not provided
 - Yes, additional information could be requested, but we didn’t feel we needed any
 - No, it was not possible to request additional information
 - I don’t know
21. Were you able to request presentations from additional experts or stakeholders beyond those lined up by the organisers?
- Yes, additional experts or stakeholders were requested and gave a presentation to the assembly
 - Yes, additional experts or stakeholders were requested, but did not gave a presentation to the assembly
 - Yes, additional experts or stakeholders could be requested, but we didn’t feel we needed any
 - No, it was not possible to request additional experts or stakeholders
 - I don’t know

Learning

22. How would you rate your level of knowledge about the topic discussed after attending the citizens’ assembly?
- I have not learned much about the topic.
 - I have learned a little more about the topic.
 - I have gained a moderate amount of knowledge about the topic.
 - I have significantly increased my understanding of the topic.
 - I now consider myself very knowledgeable about the topic.

23. Please answer on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means "not at all" and 10 means "to a great extent":

- After receiving the information and hearing experts, I felt confident enough to work on recommendations.
- As a result of my participation in the citizens' assembly, I can now better understand the arguments of others.
- I changed my views on the issues discussed during the deliberations.

Quality of Participation and Deliberation

24. The other members listened to me with respect, even when they didn't agree with me. ()

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

25. During the discussions, I had ample opportunity to express myself. ()

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

26. I have had sufficient opportunities and time to engage and I was able to contribute to the discussions and conclusions prepared by my working group. ()

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

27. There was a large difference in the speaking time of members during the deliberations:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

28. The atmosphere and exchanges with other members were generally: ()

- Very positive
- Rather positive
- Neither positive nor negative
- Rather negative
- Negative
- Very negative

29. The issue was discussed from a variety of perspectives, considering underlying values and possible trade-offs. Please answer from a scale from 0 to 10:

- 0 means “The issue was discussed from a very limited number of perspectives”
- 10 means “The issue was discussed from a wide range of perspectives”

Quality of decision-making

30. How clear and fair did you find the decision-making process of the assembly (e. g. voting)? ()

- The decision-making process was very clear and fair
- The decision-making process was mostly clear and fair
- The decision-making process was not very clear but seemed fair
- The decision-making process was not very clear and seemed somewhat unfair
- The decision-making process was unclear and unfair
- I don’t know
- [Textbox: Indicate why the decision-making process was not clear or fair or both]

31. To what extent, if at all, do you feel that the final recommendations reflected the different views and judgements of the members? Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “the diversity was not at all reflected” and 10 means “ultimately, our recommendations broadly satisfied the concerns of all members”.

32. My own views about the issue under discussion are sufficiently reflected in the final recommendations.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Somewhat disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Trust and Political Efficacy

33. Please rate on a scale of 0 to 10 how much you personally trust each of the institutions listed, where 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust.

()

- Country’s parliament
- Government
- Legal System
- Politicians
- Political Parties

34. Do you trust in the commitment of the government or the authority holding the citizens’ assembly to take your recommendations into account? Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “no trust at all” and 10 means “full trust”. ()

If you have further suggestions, comments or feedback, please submit them here:

Questionnaire for participants — Minimum Version

Personal Information

How old are you? • Under 18 • 18-24 • 25-34 • 35-44 • 45-54 • 55-65 • 66+
What is your gender identity? • Female • Male • Non-binary • Prefer not to say
What is your highest level of education and your current occupation? Education Level: • Less than High school • High school diploma or equivalent • Vocational training • Some college, no degree • Bachelor's degree • Graduate degree
Occupation: • Entry-level position • Mid-level position • Senior-level position • Self-employed • Not currently employed

Questionnaire

Overall experience

1. To what extent, if at all, has it been a good experience to participate in the citizens' assembly?
 - To a great extent
 - To a high extent
 - Moderately
 - To a low extent
 - Not at all

Task and design

2. Is the task given to the citizens' assembly clear to you? ()
 - The task was very clear.
 - The task was mostly clear.
 - The task was clear.
 - The task was not clear enough.
 - The task was not clear at all.
 - I don't know.
3. Do you understand how the recommendations you are working on will be taken up by the commissioning authority? ()
 - Yes, I fully understand what will happen to our recommendations.
 - I have a good understanding of what will happen to our recommendations.
 - I have a general idea of what will happen to our recommendations.
 - I am somewhat unsure about what will happen to our recommendations.
 - No, I do not understand what will happen to our recommendations.

Logistics

4. Did you receive sufficient support (e.g., travel reimbursement, childcare, accessibility accommodations) to participate fully?
 - Yes, I received all the support I needed.
 - Yes, I received most of the support I needed.
 - I received some support, but more was needed. [Specify:]
 - I received minimal support and struggled to participate fully. [Specify:]
 - No, I did not receive sufficient support to participate fully.
 - Not applicable / I did not need any support.

Learning

Please answer on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 means "not at all" and 10 means "to a great extent":

5. After receiving the information and hearing experts, I felt confident enough to work on recommendations.
6. As a result of my participation in the citizens' assembly, I can now better understand the arguments of others.

Quality of Participation and Deliberation

7. I have had sufficient opportunities and time to engage with others and I was able to contribute to the discussions and conclusions prepared by my working group. ()
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Somewhat disagree

- Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
8. The issue was discussed from a variety of perspectives, considering underlying values and possible trade-offs. Please answer from a scale from 0 to 10:
- 0 means “The issue was discussed from a very limited number of perspectives”
 - 10 means “The issue was discussed from a wide range of perspectives”

Quality of decision-making

9. My own views about the issue under discussion are sufficiently reflected in the final recommendations.
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Somewhat disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
10. How clear and fair did you find the decision-making process of the assembly (e. g. voting)? ()
- The decision-making process was very clear and fair
 - The decision-making process was mostly clear and fair
 - The decision-making process was not very clear but seemed fair
 - The decision-making process was not very clear and seemed somewhat unfair
 - The decision-making process was unclear and unfair
 - I don't know

Trust and Political Efficacy

11. Do you trust in the government's commitment to take your recommendations into account?
Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “no trust at all” and 10 means “full trust”.
()
12. After participating in the citizens' assembly, did you feel more empowered to do any of the following?
- I do not feel more empowered to engage in political or community activities.
 - Engaging in political discussions with friends, family and colleagues
 - Volunteering for community or political causes
 - Joining or organizing advocacy groups or grassroots movements
 - Voting in local, regional, national or EU elections
 - Campaigning for a political party or candidate
 - Participating in local government or community meetings
 - Running for a public office or local position
 - Supporting or contributing to political campaigns (e.g., donations)
 - Signing petitions or engaging in online activism
 - Other [Please specify] [Textbox]