Report meeting 2 burgerberaad schone stad

Meeting 2: learning more about the topic

Saturday, March 23, 2024, 9:30 AM – 3:00 PM, Pakhuis de Zwijger in Amsterdam
Number of participants present: 106

Agenda

1. Opening & welcome
2. The waste quiz
3. The question, process, and agreements
4. Expert sessions
5. Conclusion

Who is present?

- The organization and facilitators
- Researchers from The Hague University of Applied Sciences and Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences are observing and conducting an independent analysis of the civic assembly.
- Interpreters for non-native speakers
- Experts

1. Opening by the chairperson

Introduction
Chairperson Menno van Tartwijk welcomes everyone to the 2nd session of the burgerberaad! The question "How do we collectively keep the city cleaner?" is at the forefront. We are working towards providing advice on how the city can manage waste. The municipal council will adopt the advice provided it is legally and financially feasible and practically executable.

In the first meeting, you all got acquainted with each other and with the issue at hand. You also selected themes. Today, based on these themes, you will engage in discussions with experts so that you, the burgerberaad, can provide even better advice.

During the next meeting (April 20), we will venture into the city and learn more from practical experiences during excursions to places like AEB, Renewi, and neighborhood initiatives. These practical examples can also help you formulate advice. During the fourth meeting (May 23), you will draft the initial advice. These will then be reviewed by an evaluation committee to ensure feasibility and viability. This process increases the likelihood of the council adopting the advice. On July 6, the feedback will be presented by the evaluation committee, and you can refine the advice. On July 15, you will vote on these recommendations. The outcome will determine which recommendations are forwarded to the council. You own the process, and we are here to guide you.

Incidentally, today is also National Cleanup Day! On this day, neighbors come together to clean up the neighborhood. Many people in the room are aware of this and are actively participating in their neighborhoods.

The city is actively engaged with you. Emails are coming in with ideas on how to keep the city cleaner. These ideas can be found on the online platform.

Today is dedicated to learning about waste. Experts have been invited for participants to engage with. The civic assembly will split into groups to discuss themes with an expert. Everyone will have the opportunity to attend three different expert sessions.

2. The Wast Quiz

To test your knowledge of waste and to get you excited for the discussions with experts, we will conduct a Waste Quiz featuring questions about waste, a clean city, and Amsterdam. Kyra emerged as the winner and received a big round of applause! The questions, answers, and explanations can be found in the presentation of the meeting.

3. The question, process and agreements

Before the burgerberaad engages in discussions with experts, there will be a vote on several matters that the civic assembly needs to establish. These pertain to the following four decisions:

- How do we make decisions?
- How do we interact with each other?
- How do we interact with the outside world?
- How do we handle the media?

The civic assembly determines how they want to address these questions. For each decision to be made, we follow a fixed voting procedure:

1. Exchange of thoughts with neighbors or within your group about the proposal.
2. Indicative voting using green and red voting cards.
3. Participants who voted green and red express their reasons for their vote (statements for and against).
4. Final voting via Menti.

Vraag	Antwoord
How many pieces of advice are required?	Ultimately, it is up to the burgerberaad to come up with advice. There is no minimum or maximum number of advices required.
Do you mean 67% of the total participants or 67% of the votes cast?	We propose to adhere to a majority of 67% of the votes **cast**, not of the total participants.

Vote 1: How do we make decisions?
It is important for the burgerberaad to first decide on the voting process for proposals or recommendations. The question is: "What should the majority be to accept a recommendation or proposal?" Menno explained that there are several options. You can decide to accept a proposal when 51% of the votes cast are in favor (green). The advantage of this is that it is relatively easy to adopt a proposal. The disadvantage is that the level of support at 51% is low, and decisions can be made where 49% of voters disagree. Another option is that everyone must agree with a proposal, hence 100%. The advantage of this is that the level of support is high. The disadvantage is that it is

difficult to make decisions. If one participant votes against, a proposal is not adopted. This is therefore not realistic. Therefore, we propose to adhere to a 2/3rd majority - rounded to 67%. This proposal falls between the other two options. This percentage is also used, for example, in politics for amending the Constitution.

Proposal:
If 2/3 (67%) of the votes cast are in favor, we accept a proposal.

Polling
Many green voting cards, a few red ones.

Menno walks through the room and lets the "green" and "red" participants speak:

Green:

- "67% is a nice middle ground. There is enough support, and the bar is not set too high."
- "Nothing to add."

Red:

- "Raise the bar a bit because we have 150 people."
- "I think we should do something about the blank votes. If many people vote blank but there is still a 67% majority, then there are still very few people."

One participant also asked how many votes are needed to adopt this proposal. We don't know exactly either. This may be the most difficult vote because we haven't made any agreements about this yet. But we have to start somewhere.

Final voting

Voting: 85% in favor, 15% against; the proposal is accepted.

This is an overwhelming majority. The proposal is accepted.

Comment from a participant: a good democracy also considers how to deal with the minority vote.

Vote 2: How do we interact with each other?
Proposal:

- We stick to the issue at hand
- We engage in dialogue, not debate
- We let each other speak
- We strive to come up with good advice

Polling
Two people voted red, the rest green.

Green:

- "I find these proposals reasonable. Especially the distinction between debate and dialogue is important."
- "These are familiar conversation rules; we already discussed them in the first meeting."

Red:

- "The arguments of the minority are not being considered."
- "People who speak loudly often dominate the conversation. Ensure that everyone gets an equal opportunity to speak."
    - Response: This is also the instruction to the facilitators. They will ensure this.

Final Voting

Voting: 89% in favor, 11% against; the proposal is accepted.

Vote 3: Interacting with the outside world

How do we, as the burgerberaad, want to interact with the outside world? What do we want to communicate - or not communicate - with friends, family, acquaintances, and the press? Do we want to be fully transparent on all topics, or do we want to exercise discretion in communication on certain matters?

This means that with friends and family, you can share that you are participating in a burgerberaad and what you have been doing, but you do not discuss the draft recommendations and the content discussed. This prevents ideas about recommendations from ending up in the newspaper or on social media, and people thinking that these recommendations are also being accepted. It is also important to us that the burgerberaad is a safe environment. Therefore, do not take photos of each other without permission or share what a fellow participant has said.

Proposal: We are transparent about the process, not about the content.

Polling

Many people voted red, a small number voted green.

Green:

- "We shouldn't discuss recommendations, but we can share the knowledge we gain."
- "I think many people confuse content and process."

Red:

- "I would like to be able to share knowledge with others to generate ideas for recommendations. Privacy should be respected, of course."
- "We are representatives of the city, so we should be able to discuss content."
- "I find the proposal not entirely complete. It should be added: '...until the decision is made.'"

Final voting

Voting: 28% in favor, 72% against; the proposal is rejected.

A conversation followed in the room about how we could improve the proposal. Here's a proposal that emerged:

New proposal for interaction with the outside world: We are transparent about the process and refrain from discussing the draft recommendations until July 15, respecting everyone's privacy.

Polling
There were more green voting cards than red ones.

Green:

- "You shouldn't disclose matters discussed here to the public."
- "I was against it just now, but now I'm for it because I think it's important not to discuss the draft recommendations between July 6 and 15. Until then, you can discuss the content of the assembly."

Red:

- "You should always be able to talk about this because we represent the city."
- "We need to differentiate between content and draft proposals. You can share the content but not the recommendations."
- "There needs to be something concrete in there. I find it acceptable between July 6 and 15, but I'm not willing to commit to confidentiality for the entire period."
- "If you want to phrase it properly, it takes time and patience. It takes time to have a discussion and define how to engage in dialogue with each other."

Voting: 66% in favor, 34% against; the proposal is rejected.

Following another discussion, a new proposal for interaction with the outside world emerged:

New proposal: We are transparent about both the process and the content. However, between July 6 and 15, we refrain from sharing anything about the draft recommendations. This is to respect everyone's privacy.

Voting: 83% in favor, 17% against; the proposal is accepted.

Vote 4: How do we interact with the media?
Proposal: The media is welcome after each meeting for feedback from the chairperson (Menno) and participants who wish to speak with the media (if more than 5 people want to talk, we will draw lots on the spot). The media is also welcome at the final meeting after voting on the recommendations.

Question from the audience: How do we handle it if people are approached on social media or by the media in between meetings?
Green:

- "I have no problem with the media being present after meetings."

Red:

- "As far as I'm concerned, the media can be present everywhere. The court or the municipal council is also public, so why not here?"

Voting: 56% in favor, 44% against; the proposal is rejected.

Suggestions from the audience to refine the proposal:

- "Just like in the previous proposal, we can refine it by also refraining from engaging with the media between July 6 and 15."
- "You can extensively discuss the process, but when discussing content, you can speak on a personal basis."
- "I have issues with individual participants speaking with the media, especially because the media doesn't always handle things fairly."

New proposal on interacting with the media: The media is welcome. We speak from ourselves with the media whenever we want. Between July 6 and 15, we refrain from sharing anything about the draft recommendations.

Voting: 57% in favor, 43% against; the proposal is rejected.

Due to time constraints, voting on this topic will be postponed until later. First, participants will engage in discussions with experts.

At 3:00 PM, a new alternative proposal will be presented to the civic assembly. For clarity, we will divide the voting into this section:

On one hand, every participant should feel free to express their opinions without feeling restricted by the presence of the media. On the other hand, we also understand the importance of keeping the media informed about certain aspects of the civic assembly. Therefore, we have drafted the following alternative proposal:

New proposal on interacting with the media: No media present during the meetings; in the case of media requests, a group of members and the chairperson of the civic assembly will speak with the media; if you are approached by the media, feel free to speak from your own experiences; radio silence between July 6 and 15.

Voting: 91% in favor, 9% against; the proposal is accepted.

4. Expert sessions

There are three rounds of 45 minutes each. Upon arrival in the morning, participants can choose a knowledge route consisting of three expert sessions. Each session takes place in a different part of the building and can accommodate approximately 15 people at a time.

Interpreters accompany groups where not everyone speaks Dutch. The groups are organized accordingly. Some experts also provided presentations. These presentations will be posted on the platform as soon as we receive them.

5. Afsluiting

Because we aim to finish on time as much as possible, we have decided to postpone the group photo to a later moment.

At the end of the day, several participants shared their thoughts on the day:

- "Gained a lot of information and quite a few ideas came up."

- "Comprehensive, interesting, and informative. Looking forward to the next assembly. Very positive."
- "Dirk Groot's story was very interesting. I hope we can apply that in Amsterdam too."

Then followed the vote on handling the media (see above).

Finally, some administrative announcements were made, with the most important one being that the next meeting, on April 20, will **not** take place at Pakhuis de Zwijger, but at **B.Amsterdam**, Johan Huizingalaan 763a in Amsterdam.