

National Policymaking Forum

- a) The policymaking body would have a composition of 50% members, elected through Omov, and 50% representatives of affiliated organisations. MPs and councillors would have non voting roles (advisory only);
- b) It would focus on doing what Conference cannot do, including developing more detailed policy
- c) Policy forums and events need to be more highly advertised and made more transparent through a clearly advertised programme of public consultative events in which members are invited to have their say;
- d) There should be more transparency about the process of developing the reports, and how staff decide what proposals go into them and which ones don't;
- e) The policymaking body would have clear mechanisms to communicate with members;
- f) There should be surveys to members allowing them to sign up to particular issues;
- g) The publishing of the commission reports should be published sufficiently in advance of Conference to allow CLPs to debate them, and if they choose, to mandate delegates accordingly;
- h) To allow proper democratic choice, Conference should be able to vote on alternative options that are supported by a minority of NPF delegates.

Conference

- a) Delegates to Conference would be allowed to attend and vote remotely rather than attending in person, thus increasing CLP representation while limiting the logistical pressure on Conference staff;
- b) Getting rid of the restrictive 'contemporary' criteria.

To be discussed

- a) Whether or not to retain the name 'National Policy Forum' or to replace it with another name (please make suggestions). This is important because making a democratic policymaking body work effectively requires people to believe in it, so a lot of the promotional work is could be really important.
- b) Mandating should be formalised by CLPs so members know how their mandated delegates vote. There wasn't total clarity on how this could be achieved. One option suggested was sending in their mandating decisions on all topics which are expected to be discussed at Conference to membersnet in advance. These could be publically available, as should the final votes of the CLP delegates (as is currently the case with the NCC voting).
- c) There was a discussion of the priorities ballot but it wasn't clear if any definitive recommendation was arrived at.
- d) There was also a discussion of the role of policy experts, but there needs to be further discussion of how these are integrated into the policymaking process.