Citizens’ Jury on Reasonable Expectations

Overview of 3-day jury activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Overview of activities</th>
<th>Main participants (other than facilitators)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Day 1, AM  | • Complete start of jury questionnaire  
                        • induction/getting to know one another  
                        • group “practice exercise” based on the JK Rowling legal case (Murray v Express Newspapers plc), asking the jurors whether there was a reasonable expectation of privacy | None                                                                |
| Day 1, PM  | • brief introduction to the Anita scenario, health records and relevant law (15 minutes total?) with questions and answers from the jury  
                        • Q1 of Anita story  
                                o story role play (e.g. by jurors)  
                                o “balancing witness” asks witness why the information sharing described in the Anita scenario is needed  
                                o small group work to identify what else the jurors would like to understand about this part of the scenario  
                                o Q&A between jurors and witnesses  
                                o small group work with groups identifying reasons why information should be shared and reasons why it should be kept private for this part of the scenario  
                                o individual jurors make notes with their initial views on whether it is reasonable for Anita to expect information to be shared | Witness: Dr Katherine Checkland  
Balancing witness: Jon Fistein? |
| Day 2, AM  | • Reflection on day one and any questions about what was done  
                        • Q2 of Anita story – repeat as for Q1 above  
                        • Q3 of Anita story – repeat as for Q1 above | Malcolm Oswald  
Witnesses: Dave Clemmett, Robert Doran  
Balancing witness: Jon Fistein |
| Day 2, PM  | • Q4 of story - repeat as for Q1 above  
                        • Q5 of story - repeat as for Q1 above | Witnesses: Helen McManus, Niels Peek  
Balancing witness: Jon Fistein |
| Day 3, AM  | • Reflection on day one and any questions about what was done  
                        • Vote on Anita scenario Q1 to Q5 (yes/no)  
                        • Agree potential jury answers for “why” questions  
                        • Individuals select answers to why questions Q1 to Q5  
                        • Group work to answer Q6 on what might have made sharing acceptable where a majority said it was not reasonable for Anita to expect it to be shared | Malcolm Oswald |
- Answer questions 7 and 8 – the “criteria” of when it is reasonable to expect privacy and when it is reasonable to expect information to be shared
- Develop jury report with jury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 3, PM</th>
<th>Analyse two case studies in groups, and apply the jury’s own “criteria” from Q7 and Q8 to the case study (case studies to be determined e.g. Deepmind/ Royal Free case study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review whether testing the criteria on the case studies means the criteria should change (and if so, change the jury report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End-of-jury questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wrap-up and goodbye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>