1 Q: The bid document says the Jury should include 5 days of deliberation. Does this mean 5 full days (or the equivalent number of hours)? Or five sessions – of varying lengths?

A: We expect there to be a sufficient period of time to examine the overarching questions and the topic, this includes hearing and engaging from a range of expert witnesses, time to process information, deliberation, and producing recommendations. We expect this to happen over at least 5 days, the length and timings of the days and sessions within the days will be up to the contractors to propose and include in their application.

2 Q: As part of the representative Jury sample, is it important to recruit participants from across England, or would recruiting from a smaller area, while stratifying by other characteristics (e.g. gender, age, ethnicity, education etc.), be sufficient? For face-to-face events, it’s easier and less expensive to convene (a diverse range of) people from one region, rather than from across the country.

A: The Nuffield Council on Bioethics’ remit for the Jury sample is to have a broadly representative demographic mix of England. Ideally, we would want to see participants, from urban and rural areas, recruited across different regions of England, however, we recognise that bringing participants together across England to one location can have financial and practical implications, therefore, we are open to alternative models of jury design and approaches to location, especially if this enables you to add extra value to other aspects of your application.

3 Q: Is the NCOB keen to recruit participants to deliberate together in a single location as a single jury over a five day period, or would the NCOB be open to alternative models – for instance, taking a regional focus in their deliberations (in previous deliberations we have recruited participants in three different regions from across the UK, deliberating in smaller sizes, and reconvening them together online for instance)? In both instances the sample size can still be broadly reflective of the makeup of the overall population of England, but the financial implications for transport, for instance, can be very different.

A: The Nuffield Council on Bioethics’ remit for the Jury sample is to have a broadly representative demographic mix of England. Ideally, we would want to see
participants recruited, from urban and rural areas, across different regions of England, however, we recognise that bringing participants together across England to one location can have financial implications, therefore, we are open to alternative models of jury design and approaches to location, especially if this enables you to add extra value to other aspects of your application.

4 Q: For the Jury outcome, do you envisage a series of Juror recommendations, areas of consensus, or something more exploratory without specified objectives?

A: We would like to have a series of recommendations, how they were reached and findings from jury members. How these recommendations are reached, either by consensus or voting, will be down to the contractors to propose and include in their application.

5 Q: The ITT suggests a minimum of 30 participants for the citizen jury – would NCOB be open to indicating what the maximum number of participants would be (this would of course need to be proportionate to time and resources but we are interested to understand NCOB’s views on this)

A: We would like to have a larger number of participants for the Citizens’ Jury. We estimate this to be somewhere between 30-40 participants due to time and resources however we do not have a maximum number of participants. Contractors should be clear about the reasons for the proposed jury size in their applications.

6 Q: For the citizen jury would NCOB prefer a sample broadly representative of the make up of the English population, or would it like to purposively sample the demographics of the jury to some extent to ensure the representation of minority communities?

A: The Citizens’ Jury sample should be broadly representative of the demographic mix of England, including people of different ages, genders, ethnicities, employment status and educational attainment. It is important that the sample reflects a diversity of views, and this may mean combining reflective sampling with purposive oversampling of minority groups or diversifying the recruitment methodology to engage with certain populations. We are open to receiving applications that propose combining sampling methods to ensure the representation of minority groups, but we expect contractors to put forward a clear justification for the method of sampling, taking into account diversity and inclusivity.

7 Q: The ITT suggests that the survey sample size needs to be credible. Does NCOB have any indicative minimum sample sizes that they would like to share, drawing from their prior work and experience?

A: We are considering the survey to be a nationally representative sample of around 2,000 adults.

Evaluation

8 Q: Please can you elaborate on your expectations for the evaluation? Do you envisage it entailing full observation of the process (e.g., to include attendance
at any in-person jury sessions) or could this be carried out remotely (e.g., based primarily on survey responses and remote interviews with participants)?

A: The purpose of the evaluation will be to capture satisfaction and feedback from both the surveys and the Citizens’ Jury. One element of the evaluation will be to track the Citizens’ Jury in ‘real time’ to identify adjustments that are needed to achieve its purpose and to meet the jurors’ needs. We expect the evaluation to include an opportunity for jurors to reflect on their experience of being part of the jury - and reflections from facilitators and expert witnesses. We also would expect the evaluation to capture feedback from jurors, particularly about potential bias. We would expect the evaluation to cover the whole jury process but do not have any specific expectations on whether this is to be carried out remotely or in person, so it is up to the contractor to recommend what they think is the most appropriate methodology (this could be a mixed methods approach).

Wider project

9 Q: Has a literature review been conducted? Would this be a component of the work to underpin the development of the questionnaire?

A: We are in the early stages of our project, and therefore a literature review has not been conducted. We are currently considering different methods to assist with the development of the questionnaire and materials to accompany the survey and we are open to hearing suggestions from the contractors. However, a literature review is not expected as part of the proposal.

10 Q: Is there scope to include arts-based methodologies, such as poetry and photographs, to express findings in an exhibition at the end of the project?

A: We have set 22 months to undertake the project, this includes dedicated time for influencing and post-project follow up activities. As detailed in the tender, we want a creative video delivered to describe the Citizens’ Jury process and findings in a concise and engaging way. We would be interested in hearing further co-produced creative ideas, for the Nuffield Council on Bioethics’ to consider, to engage the findings of the public engagement work with key policy makers and decision makers. The delivery of the outputs detailed in the tender is, however, essential.

Application process

11 Q: The response must be no more than 4,000 words but there is a mention of appendices being outside of this. Can you please confirm whether the following can be submitted as appendices:
   a. The Gantt chart (which we will produce in an excel spreadsheet)
   b. An itemised cost breakdown (this will be easier to present in an excel spreadsheet)
   c. CVs of the project team

A: Charts, tables, graphs, and CVs can be submitted as appendices.