

# RACQ

## Review of Citizens' Jury public consultation process

Final Report  
4th June 2020



# Contents

Section	Page
Introduction	3
Summary of controls	6
Detailed findings	9



# Introduction

## Background

RACQ ReThink CTP is an advocacy initiative designed to inform and educate Queensland motorists around their CTP scheme.

Encompassing part of this campaign, RACQ initiated a Citizens' Jury which provided a platform for the Queensland community to come together to participate in sessions to discuss and debate what an effective CTP scheme may resemble and to explore the pros and cons of the current scheme.

In order to remain independent from the process, RACQ engaged DemocracyCo, a third party organisation, to facilitate the end to end process of the Citizens' Jury component of the campaign. This was intended to ensure that a representative view and outcome was achieved. The Citizens' Jury was designed to incorporate a cross sectional view of the community into the decision making process.

PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) was engaged to perform specified procedures over the controls of the Citizens' Jury process.

## Objective and scope

RACQ engaged PwC to perform a range of procedures over the Citizens' Jury component of the ReThink CTP campaign that was conducted from December 2019 to March 2020.

RACQ and PwC agreed the specified procedures to be undertaken. These procedures are set out in Detailed Findings of this report and involve a mix of inquiry, observations at the Citizens' Jury sessions, and review of key records and systems.

The specified procedures included consideration of controls across the following elements of the Citizens' Jury process:

1. Community survey and stakeholder correspondence
2. Public submissions
3. Invitation process for the Citizens' Jury
4. Jury selection and recruitment process
5. Citizens' Jury workshops
6. Jury reporting

# Introduction (cont'd)

## Scope exclusions

PwC's engagement did not constitute an audit in accordance with the Australian Auditing Standards or a review in accordance with the Australian Auditing Standards application to review engagements. Accordingly, no such assurance is provided in this deliverable.

PwC is not required, as part of its engagement, to provide any recommendations on the current controls design, nor does the engagement require PwC to design any further controls. All control design decisions were the sole responsibility of RACQ's management.

In order to conduct the engagement, PwC had no involvement in any of the following activities:

- RACQ's education and awareness raising campaign
- Development and publishing of the deliberative guide (including the full format and the excerpts to be made available as videos)
- Advocacy undertaken by RACQ or members of the jury on completion of the Citizens' Jury process.

Further details regarding this engagement are set out on page 30 of this report.



# Introduction (cont'd)

## Procedures performed by PwC

RACQ and DemocracyCo developed a set of procedures and controls for the management of the Citizens' Jury process. The objective of these controls was to ensure that the process was administered and facilitated by DemocracyCo independently from RACQ and that the Jury Report was representative of the views of participants in the Citizens' Jury process.

PwC performed the specified procedures to assess the operation of these controls. The results of each of the procedures performed are outlined in the detailed findings of this report.

The following highlights the total number of phases reviewed, the expected controls identified across each phase and the specified procedures performed. The key controls have been highlighted in the next section of the report and provide further insights to validate and assess the process.

A

Total number of identified phases

6

B

Number of expected controls across the six phases

22

C

Specified procedures performed

22

# Summary of controls

Phase	Key controls
<b>Phase 1: Community survey and stakeholder correspondence</b>	<p>The survey was managed by an external (independent) market research panel with verified participants.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The survey was unbranded (participants did not know who had commissioned the research).</li> <li>2. Participants could not complete the survey more than once.</li> <li>3. Survey to only be completed by humans (to prevent manipulation through use of a bot).</li> <li>4. Sample size of survey participants (n=1018).</li> <li>5. Participants not meeting the specified criteria were excluded from the survey.</li> <li>6. The survey responses were weighted to achieve results that were proportionate to the demographics of the respondent population.</li> <li>7. Relevant stakeholder groups were invited to participate in a Jury Advisory Group (JAG) to provide relevant information to the Citizens' Jury regarding key aspects of CTP insurance.</li> <li>8. Jury Advisory Group (JAG) sessions were independently facilitated by DemocracyCo.</li> <li>9. Sessions were facilitated in line with an agenda and attendance was recorded.</li> </ol>
<b>Phase 2: Public submissions</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Submissions template was made available on RethinkCTP website.</li> <li>2. A call for public submissions was promoted by government through media and directly to organisations that are expected to have an interest in the process.</li> <li>3. All submissions received were provided to the Citizens' Jury.</li> </ol>
<b>Phase 3: Jury invitation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Citizens' Jury invitations were distributed to a random selection of citizens from the RACQ database and ABC VoteCompass database.</li> <li>2. Response to jury invitation were directed to DemocracyCo and are not received by RACQ.</li> </ol>
<b>Phase 4: Jury selection</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Selection of Citizens' Jury participants was designed to align with demographic characteristics of the broader population regarding gender, location and age.</li> </ol>
<b>Phase 5: Citizens' Jury</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Jury sessions were facilitated independently of RACQ.</li> <li>2. A prepared agenda was adhered to during Citizens' Jury sessions.</li> <li>3. Output of Jury sessions were provided to Citizens' Jury participants with an opportunity to confirm and provide comment.</li> <li>4. Citizens' Jury members were presented with outputs of prior phases of the process (community survey, JAG, public submissions) to inform consideration of relevant issues.</li> </ol>
<b>Phase 6: Jury reporting</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Jury members prepared a Jury Report, with voting to determine a majority consensus on all recommendations.</li> <li>2. All edits to the Jury Report were reviewed and confirmed by jurors.</li> <li>3. Jurors were provided an opportunity to present a minority view on the Jury Report, if required.</li> </ol>

# Detailed findings

## Process Phase 1

Community Survey and Stakeholder Correspondence

### Key control

1.1) The survey was managed by an external (independent) market research panel with verified participants.

### Specified procedure

Verify that an external market research panel was utilised in the survey distribution.

### Finding/observation

- RACQ noted in the Independent Community Survey results that the participants were sourced through McNair YellowSquares, the independent market research panel.
- PwC obtained and reviewed the quote provided to RACQ by McNair YellowSquares that details the services provided, which included sourcing the participants and hosting the online survey.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 1

Community Survey and Stakeholder Correspondence

## Key control

1.2) The survey was unbranded (participants did not know who has commissioned the research).

## Specified procedure

Obtain a copy of the survey to verify that it was unbranded.

## Finding/observation

- PwC obtained an export of the distributed survey and verified that the survey was unbranded.
- PwC confirmed that the survey did not include information to identify the party commissioning the research.



# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 1

Community Survey and Stakeholder Correspondence

### Key control

1.3) Participants could not complete the survey more than once.

### Specified procedure

Review the design of controls that are established to prevent multiple survey submissions by a single respondent.

### Finding/observation

- PwC observed the following controls that were designed to prevent multiple submissions from the same survey respondent:
  - Participants were required to provide a valid address and mobile phone number prior to completing the survey;
  - Only unique mobile numbers can be registered;
  - A valid phone number was required as part of a two factor authentication process in order to access the survey.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 1

Community Survey and Stakeholder Correspondence

## Key control

1.4) Survey to only be completed by humans (to prevent manipulation through use of a bot).

## Specified procedure

Review the design of controls in place to prevent manipulation through bot usage.

## Finding/observation

- PwC observed the use of CAPTCHA technology to manage access to the survey, whereby participants were required to enter the correct input to confirm that they were not a bot.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 1

Community Survey and Stakeholder Correspondence

## Key control

1.5) Sample size of survey participants (n=1018).

## Specified procedure

Verify sample size through review of raw survey data.

## Finding/observation

- PwC reviewed the agreement with McNair YellowSquares for survey participants which requires that 1000 survey responses were to be obtained
- PwC obtained the raw survey results and verified that 1,023 responses were received. It was not feasible to confirm that this was an exhaustive list of all responses received, however it is noted that the total number of responses exceeded the target sample size.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 1

Community Survey and Stakeholder Correspondence

## Key control

1.6) Participants not meeting the specified criteria were excluded from the survey.

## Specified procedure

Obtain details of mechanisms in place to ensure responses were submitted by a representation of Queensland motorists.

## Finding/observation

- PwC reviewed the survey approach document which identified the following factors that deemed survey participants ineligible:
  - Those under the age of 16;
  - Anyone who worked in a legal or insurance profession;
  - Anyone who resided outside of Queensland.
- PwC reviewed survey results and confirmed that all participants had confirmed their adherence with the above characteristics through the survey process.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 1

Community Survey and Stakeholder Correspondence

## Key control

1.7) The survey responses were weighted to achieve results that were proportionate to the demographics of the respondent population.

## Specified procedure

Obtain details of mechanisms in place to ensure that survey results were weighted to achieve results that were proportionate to the demographics of the respondent population.

## Finding/observation

- PwC was advised that a weighting factor was applied to survey results based on the following demographic characteristics:
  - Age of survey respondent;
  - Gender of survey respondent; and
  - Home address (by region) of survey respondent.
- PwC reviewed the survey results and confirmed that a weighting factor was applied in line with the above demographic characteristics.
- It was not feasible for PwC to validate the correct calculation of the weighted score based on the information that was made available.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 1

Community Survey and Stakeholder Correspondence

## Key control

1.8) Relevant stakeholder groups were invited to participate in a Jury Advisory Group (JAG) to provide relevant information to the Citizens' Jury regarding key aspects of CTP insurance.

## Specified procedure

Review selection and participation of identified stakeholder groups in the JAG.

## Finding/observation

- The following stakeholder groups were identified for participation in a JAG:

Stakeholder group	Invited	Participated
<b>Legal group</b>	Queensland Law Society Australian Lawyers Alliance Queensland Bar Association Shine Lawyers	Shine Lawyers
<b>Insurer (other than RACQ)</b>	Allianz Australia Ltd QBE Insurance Suncorp Group	Suncorp Group
<b>Government representation</b>	Motor Accident Insurance Commission (MAIC)	–
<b>Health advocates</b>	Australian Medical Association Queensland Australian Physiotherapy Association Health Consumers Queensland Queensland Council of Social Services (QCOSS)	Health Consumers Queensland

- PwC confirmed that invitations for participation in the JAG were provided to each of the above groups on 10 November 2019.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 1

Community Survey and Stakeholder Correspondence

## Key control

1.9) Sessions were facilitated in line with an agenda and attendance recorded.

## Specified procedure

1. Attend JAG sessions
2. Review outputs from sessions to verify consistency with observations
3. Review attendance register for accuracy

## Finding/observation

- PwC attended JAG sessions on 10 December 2019 and 24 January 2020 and observed that these sessions were facilitated by DemocracyCo in line with the agenda provided prior to the sessions.
- Attendance at the sessions was confirmed to be in line with information recorded in the master spreadsheet.
- PwC reviewed the output of the session and confirmed that it was consistent with the discussion from the session. The output of the sessions was a list of agreed-upon expert witnesses to present to the Citizens' Jury, covering the scope of relevant issues to be considered in reforming CTP insurance.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 2

### Public Submissions

#### Key control

2.1) Submissions template was made available on RethinkCTP website.

#### Specified procedure

Verify the availability of the public submission template on the RethinkCTP website.

#### Finding/observation

- PwC observed and validated the availability of the public submissions template on the RethinkCTP website.
- Submissions were accepted up to close of business on 7 March 2020.
- PwC obtained confirmation from the website developer that the template was available from 3 February 2020 to 7 March 2020. PwC was not able to verify whether any outages of the website occurred over this period.



# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 2

### Public Submissions

#### Key control

2.2) A call for public submissions was promoted by government through media and directly to organisations that are expected to have an interest in the process.

#### Specified procedure

Review any advertisements for public submissions and any direct correspondences sent to organisations.

#### Finding/observation

- PwC was advised that the call for public submissions was promoted through the following channels in late 2019:
  - Direct correspondence with the following organisations (Heavy Vehicle Industry Australia; Taxi Council; Lime Scooters; Bicycle Queensland; Uber; National Transport Commission; MRA Queensland; GoGet). PwC reviewed records of this correspondence;
  - Advertisement by RACQ through their corporate LinkedIn page. PwC reviewed and confirmed publication of the advertisement;
  - Email correspondence to parties that had previously expressed an interest in the process through the RethinkCTP website ([www.rethinkctp.com.au](http://www.rethinkctp.com.au)). PwC reviewed a copy of the correspondence and the mailing list for distribution. PwC was advised that the correspondence had been sent to all parties listed on the mailing list. However it was not feasible to confirm that all parties had received the correspondence.
  - A public television news story regarding the RethinkCTP campaign, however this related more broadly to the RethinkCTP campaign and did not specifically promote the call for public submissions.
  - A public submission was sought from MAIC, however MAIC declined to submit a response.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 2

### Public Submissions

#### Key control

2.3) All submissions received to be provided to the Citizens' Jury.

#### Specified procedure

1. Review process for receipt of submissions
2. Compare received submissions with submissions made available to the jury.

#### Finding/observation

- PwC was advised that all completed submissions were sent to the individual email address of a team member at DemocracyCo with individual access to the submissions. PwC was advised that the team member uploaded all submissions to the 'Basecamp' platform that was utilised for provision of information to Jurors, and was also uploaded to the RACQ 'ReThink CTP' website.
- PwC reviewed the submission template and confirmed that the submission instructions were consistent with the above process.
- PwC compared the list of 11 submissions provided by DemocracyCo and confirmed their consistency with:
  - Information uploaded to the 'Basecamp' platform; and
  - Submissions uploaded to the RACQ 'ReThink CTP' website.
- PwC was advised by DemocracyCo that all submissions that were received were uploaded to the Basecamp platform. PwC did not identify any submissions which were not uploaded. However it was not feasible for PwC to confirm that the 11 submissions were an exhaustive list of all submissions received to the individual email address of the DemocracyCo team member.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 3

### Jury Invitation

#### Key control

3.1) Citizens' Jury invitations to be distributed to a random selection of citizens from the RACQ database and ABC VoteCompass database.

#### Specified procedure

Obtain details of mechanisms in place for the distribution of jury invitations.

#### Finding/observation

- PwC was advised that invitations to participate in the Citizens' Jury were provided to the following population sets:
  - Approximately 20,000 randomly selected RACQ members; and
  - 3,500 Queensland citizens using data from the ABC VoteCompass database.
- PwC reviewed a system report which confirmed that 17,631 invitations were issued by email to a selection of the RACQ database.
- PwC reviewed correspondence with the managing party of the VoteCompass database advising that 3,500 invitations were sent randomly to Queensland residents in that database.
- PwC was advised that the randomised selection of RACQ members was conducted using functionality within the Adobe Campaign software.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 3

### Jury Invitation

#### Key control

3.2) Responses to jury invitation are directed to DemocracyCo and were not received by RACQ.

#### Specified procedure

Review invitations issued to RACQ members and VoteCompass database to verify that expressions of interest were directed to DemocracyCo.

#### Finding/observation

- PwC obtained and reviewed copies of the template invitations issued to both the RACQ database and ABC VoteCompass database. In both templates it was observed that the expression of interest link directed respondents to a DemocracyCo webpage.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 4

### Jury Selection

#### Key control

4.1) Selection of Citizens' Jury participants was designed to align with demographic characteristics of the broader population regarding gender, location and age.

#### Specified procedure

1. Review process for establishing demographic targets
2. Review demographic characteristics of Citizens' Jury participants and compare with designated demographic targets

#### Finding/observation

- PwC reviewed DemocracyCo's recruitment strategy for the jury, which details the aim to recruit a jury comprised of 57 members, with key metrics outlined for gender, location and age of the jurors. PwC verified that the demographic targets were established utilising 2016 Queensland census data.
- PwC reviewed the jury composition from 8 February 2020 and noted the following comparison with the demographic target:

	Demographic target	Initial Jury composition (8 February 2020)	Final jury composition (28 March 2020)
<b>Number of jurors</b>	57	53	31
<b>Male:</b>	50%:50%	57%:43%	55%:45%
<b>Female</b>			
<b>Region split</b>	South East Queensland: 38 Darling Downs/Wide Bay/Burnett: 8 Central Queensland: 3 Far North and North Queensland: 8	South East Queensland: 35 Darling Downs/Wide Bay/Burnett: 12 Central Queensland: 3 Far North and North Queensland: 3	South East Queensland: 22 Darling Downs/Wide Bay/Burnett: 5 Central Queensland: 2 Far North and North Queensland: 2

- It is noted that 22 jurors withdrew from the process between the initial and final jury sessions.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 5

### Citizens' Jury

#### Key control

5.1) Jury sessions were facilitated independently of RACQ.

#### Specified procedure

On a sample basis, attend Citizens' Jury sessions to observe and confirm procedures undertaken.

#### Finding/observation

- PwC attended two Citizens' Jury sessions on 14 March 2020 and 28 March 2020. At both sessions it was observed that the Citizens' Jury was facilitated by DemocracyCo independently of RACQ. RACQ was present at the Citizens' Jury session on 14 March 2020 in a logistical role, due to RACQ hosting the session at the RACQ Eight Mile Plains office. The RACQ advocacy team was not involved in any of the sessions' activities, and were present to facilitate catering and the use of particular rooms.
- It was observed at the 28 March 2020 session (conducted online due to COVID-19) that the RACQ team were not present, with the session being facilitated by DemocracyCo.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 5

### Citizens' Jury

#### Key control

5.2) A prepared agenda was adhered to during Citizens' Jury sessions.

#### Specified procedure

On a sample basis, attend Citizens' Jury sessions to observe and confirm procedures undertaken.

#### Finding/observation

- PwC attended two Citizens' Jury sessions on 14 March 2020 and 28 March 2020 (online). Both sessions attended by PwC (14 March 2020 and 28 March 2020) were verified as being facilitated in line with the agenda provided prior to the sessions. There were no sections of the sessions observed that were not listed on the agendas.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 5

### Citizens' Jury

#### Key control

5.3) Output of jury sessions were provided to Citizens' Jury participants with an opportunity to confirm and provide comment.

#### Specified procedure

1. Observe the outputs from Citizens' Jury sessions to assess consistency with discussion at the session
2. Review and confirm process for providing output of session to Citizens' Jury participants

#### Finding/observation

- PwC attended two Citizens' Jury sessions on 14 March 2020 and 28 March 2020 (online).
  - For the 14 March 2020 session, PwC observed that key discussion points were captured on posters during the session. These were photographed at the conclusion of the session and were uploaded to the Basecamp platform together with other information (e.g. witness recordings, survey results) that was provided to Jurors during the session. This information was accessible to all Jurors through the Basecamp platform. This platform also allowed jurors to provide comments and edits as required.
  - The 28th March 2020 session was conducted online. The outcome of the session was captured as a Draft Report from the jury. This Draft report was available to Jurors through the Basecamp platform.



# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 5

### Citizens' Jury

## Key control

5.4) Citizens' Jury was presented with outputs of prior phases of the process (community survey, JAG, public submission) to inform consideration of relevant issues.

## Specified procedure

Review information provided to Citizens' Jury participants and confirm consistency with information developed through prior phases of the process (community survey, JAG, public submissions).

## Finding/observation

- PwC reviewed the following information that was provided to Citizens' Jury participants:
  - **Results of community survey:** Results of the survey were provided to all jurors through the Basecamp platform. Information was also presented at the 14 March 2020 meeting of the Citizens' Jury. PwC observed the presentation and reviewed the report that was provided through Basecamp and confirmed that both were consistent with the outputs of the community survey.
  - **Public submissions:** PwC was advised that all completed submissions were sent to the individual email address of a team member at DemocracyCo with individual access to the submissions. PwC was advised that the team member uploaded all submissions to the 'Basecamp' platform that was utilised for provision of information to jurors, and was also uploaded to the RACQ 'ReThink CTP' website.
    - PwC reviewed the submission template and confirmed that the submission instructions were consistent with the above process.
    - PwC compared the list of 11 submissions provided by DemocracyCo and confirmed their consistency with submissions uploaded to the 'Basecamp' platform and to the RACQ 'ReThink CTP' website.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 5

### Citizens' Jury

## Key control

5.4) Citizens' Jury was presented with outputs of prior phases of the process (community survey, JAG, public submission) to inform consideration of relevant issues

## Specified procedure

Review information provided to Citizens' Jury participants and confirm consistency with information developed through prior phases of the process (community survey, JAG, public submissions).

## Finding/observation

- **Jury Advisory Group:** PwC observed the 14 March 2020 session of the Citizens' Jury where 'expert witnesses' presented a summary of issues and themes on the following topics:
  - Cover;
  - Benefits;
  - Navigation; and
  - Cost tradeoff.
- The 'expert witnesses' were representative of the stakeholder groups selected by the Jury Advisory group with the exception of the 'legal services providers' stakeholder group. PwC reviewed correspondence from DemocracyCo to various legal service providers attempting to secure involvement in the Citizens' Jury process, however this correspondence confirmed that none of the legal service providers that were approached were available to participate.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 6

### Jury Reporting

#### Key control

6.1) Jury members prepared a Jury Report, with voting to determine a majority consensus on all recommendations.

#### Specified procedure

Review and confirm processes for determining a majority consensus by jurors on recommendations included in the Jury Report.

#### Finding/observation

- PwC reviewed the briefing pack that was presented to Jurors for the Citizens' Jury session on 28 March 2020. The briefing pack defined a four step process for drafting the Jury Report:
  - Dialogue and Drafting;
  - Peer Review;
  - Editing; and
  - Polling.
- The polling stage of the process specified that a majority vote is to be attained for recommendations to be presented in the Jury Report.
- PwC observed the 28 March 2020 session of the Citizens' Jury (online) and confirmed that the process was consistent with that described in the briefing pack.
- PwC reviewed the polling results and confirmed that they were consistent with those observed at the session.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 6

### Jury Reporting

#### Key control

6.2) All edits to the Jury Report to be reviewed and confirmed by jurors

#### Specified procedure

Review and confirm processes for determining a majority consensus by jurors on recommendations included in the Jury Report.

#### Finding/observation

- PwC observed the 28 March 2020 session of the Citizens' Jury and observed the following process for developing and editing the jury report:
  - The jury was divided into several writing sub-groups which were tasked with drafting a specific section of the report.
  - Each writing sub-group was designated a 'break out room' within the Zoom video conferencing platform.
  - Each group prepared their respective section of the report on a Google Doc, which was presented to DemocracyCo and the other groups via Zoom video conferencing.
  - Peer review was conducted whereby each sub-group was paired with another group to discuss and debate the respective sections of the report and to update these accordingly.
- PwC was advised that DemocracyCo collaborated with four volunteers from the Citizens' Jury to perform further editing of the consolidated Jury Report.
- A revised draft of the Jury Report was provided to all jurors through the Basecamp platform with an invitation to comment on the revised draft. PwC reviewed the original consolidated draft Jury Report, the edited draft Jury Report and comments that were provided by jurors through the Basecamp platform. PwC observed that juror comments were discussed and debated in order to be incorporated into the edited draft Jury Report.

# Detailed findings (cont'd)

## Process Phase 6

### Jury Reporting

#### Key control

6.3) Jurors were provided an opportunity to present a minority view on the Jury Report, if required.

#### Specified procedure

Review and confirm the process to enable a juror to present a minority view on the Jury Report.

#### Finding/observation

- PwC was advised that a 'break out room' was established during the Zoom video conferencing session to enable jurors to present a minority view on the Jury Report, if required.
- PwC noted that the use of a 'break out room' to enable the preparation of minority reports was not detailed in the briefing pack for the report writing session prepared in advance, however PwC observed the process being communicated to the jury directly during the report writing session.
- PwC observed the 28 March 2020 session of the Citizens' Jury and confirmed that no jurors utilised the 'break out room' that was established to prepare a minority report.
- PwC reviewed correspondence between jurors on the Basecamp platform and noted that a separate report was prepared and posted to Basecamp by one juror (titled the 'Dissenting Report'). This report listed 5 other jurors as being contributors.
- PwC reviewed the Jury Report that was published on the Rethink CTP website and confirmed that it did not include details of the 'Dissenting Report'.

# Disclaimer

This report (“deliverable”) is not intended to be read or used by anyone other than RACQ. PwC prepared this deliverable solely for RACQ’s use and benefit, and it is subject to the limitations, exclusions and qualifications described in it and in PwC’s agreement with RACQ. In doing so, we acted exclusively for RACQ and considered no-one else’s interests.

We accept no responsibility, duty or liability:

- to anyone other than RACQ in connection with this deliverable
- to RACQ for the consequences of using or relying on it for a purpose other than that referred to above.

We make no representation concerning the appropriateness of this deliverable for anyone other than RACQ. If anyone other than RACQ chooses to use or rely on it they do so at their own risk.

This disclaimer applies:

- to the maximum extent permitted by law and, without limitation, to liability arising in negligence or under statute; and
- even if PwC consents to anyone other than RACQ receiving or using this deliverable.

This deliverable is based on information made available to PwC up to the date of this deliverable and PwC reserves the right to amend its opinions, if necessary, based on factual information that comes to PwC’s attention after that date.

For the purposes of preparing this deliverable, reliance has been placed on information and instructions provided to PwC. PwC has not sought to verify the accuracy or completeness of the information made available. PwC, its partners, its agents and servants specifically deny any liability whatsoever to any other party who may use or rely on the whole, or any part, of this deliverable or to the parties to whom it is addressed for the use, whether in whole or in part, for any purpose other than those agreed with PwC. This deliverable should not be used for any other purpose without PwC’s prior written consent. PwC does not accept any duty of care (whether in contract, tort (including negligence) or otherwise) to any person other than RACQ, and will not be responsible for any loss suffered by a third party who relies upon this deliverable.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standard Legislation.

# Thank you

[www.pwc.com.au](http://www.pwc.com.au)

© 2020 PricewaterhouseCoopers. All rights reserved.

PwC refers to the Australia member firm, and may sometimes refer to the PwC network. Each member firm is a separate legal entity. Please see [www.pwc.com/structure](http://www.pwc.com/structure) for further details.

This content is for general information purposes only, and should not be used as a substitute for consultation with professional advisors.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

PWC200110911