



Constitution-Building Technology Fair

16 November 2015, Philadelphia, USA

www.idea.int



CONSTITUTION-BUILDING TECHNOLOGY FAIR

16 NOVEMBER 2015, PHILADELPHIA, USA

*Prepared by Sanjana Hattotuwa
Edited by Kimana Zulueta-Fülscher and Sumit Bisarya*

© 2016 International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance

International IDEA
Strömsborg
SE-103 34, STOCKHOLM
SWEDEN
Tel: +46 8 698 37 00, fax: +46 8 20 24 22
Email: info@idea.int, website: www.idea.int

The electronic version of this publication is available under a Creative Commons Attribute-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 licence. You are free to copy, distribute and transmit the publication as well as to remix and adapt it provided it is only for non-commercial purposes, that you appropriately attribute the publication, and that you distribute it under an identical licence. For more information on this licence see: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>.

International IDEA publications are independent of specific national or political interests. Views expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent the views of International IDEA, its Board or its Council members.

Graphic design by Turbo Design

CONTENTS

Introduction	6
Themes	7
Keynote addresses	9
Ignite talks	12
Annex A. Agenda	19
Annex B. Synthesis of problem statements from constitution-building experts	21
About International IDEA	23

INTRODUCTION

Creating a democratic constitution is one of the most challenging processes a nation can embark on. In addition to critical political hurdles to reaching agreement among disparate groups regarding the country's basic institutional structure and vision for the future, a number of other challenges must be overcome if the constitution-making process is to succeed. These include access to information for the constitution-making body to make sure that its decisions are informed by public sentiment, expert opinion and comparative practice; ensuring transparency in the process so that the general public can follow and understand the deliberations leading to the new constitution; and encouraging public debate and receiving inputs from the public to give the citizenry a sense of ownership over their constitution. Modern constitution makers are increasingly finding solutions to these challenges through the use of information and communications technologies (ICTs). However, these products and practices have not yet been catalogued so that new processes can learn from (and build upon) existing knowledge and experience.

On 16 November 2015 International IDEA, in partnership with Google Docs and Google Ideas, organized the ICTs and Constitution-Building Tech Fair for technology entrepreneurs to present services, platforms and products that could be used in constitution-building processes, and exchange experiences and ideas with leading constitutional experts and leaders of recent constitutional transitions. This event was hosted by the National Constitutional Center, in Philadelphia, USA, and curated by the ICT4Peace Foundation.

The workshop explored the potential risks of ICTs, such as their use by spoilers and other disruptive elements to inflame the opposition, spread misinformation and disinformation, undermine public participation and confidence, leak sensitive information, stoke public tension to focus attention elsewhere, or force constituent parties to harden their stance. The Tech Fair presented ICTs as possible solutions to mitigate these risks, for they can serve as strategic, focused, purpose-driven tools in the service of constitution making, which can be used by those spearheading ICTs—and by progressive civil society and other stakeholders—to raise public awareness, encourage debate, and raise the legitimacy and acceptance of the process to anchor it into the public consciousness.

THEMES

The Tech Fair featured TED-talk-format keynote speeches on the current challenges of constitution-building and how public domain information can be leveraged to increase the level of participation in constitution-building processes. The fair also included a series of ‘ignite talks’ in which tech entrepreneurs presented their tools in the context of three interrelated aspects of any given constitution-building process: access to information, transparency in the process and encouraging public debate. The ignite talks featured 10-minute slide presentations, followed by a discussion. All the videos and accompanying explanatory information have been posted on ConstitutionNet, International IDEA’s online information portal for the global constitution-building community.¹

The three themes structured the event and the discussions. A more in-depth consideration of each of these themes, and how they relate to each other, can be found in the concept note, also available on ConstitutionNet, which was sent to all participants prior to the workshop to serve as a guideline to structure their submissions.

ACCESS TO INFORMATION ON THE PROCESS AND SUBSTANCE

Constitution making is an exercise in national sovereignty. At its core, however, there is a central tension: while each constitution must be tailored to the specific political, cultural and historical context, individuals usually charged with drafting a constitution are doing so for the first time—with little in the way of preparation and often with little familiarity with other constitutional systems. The Tech Fair addressed issues related to the role of ICTs in creating digital networks of learning and experience to assist both the constitutional process and design options, overcoming geo-spatial distance, and bridging the gap between technology and substantive matters.

TRANSPARENCY IN THE PROCESS

In most modern democracies, good practice dictates that the constitution-making process should be largely transparent and open to the public. The Tech Fair explored questions such as: Can ICTs help translate Track 1 or high-level processes for a broader public, in terms of language as well as core concepts, issues and themes in non-legalistic language that incorporates infographics, trans-media storytelling, and mobile communications apps and services? What is the tension between making a constitution-building process as transparent and participatory as possible, yet robust enough to accommodate the

¹ Read more about the event on ConstitutionNet, <<http://www.constitutionnet.org/icts-and-constitution-building-tech-fair-2015>>

necessary privacy and security to have sensitive discussions around key issues? Do ICTs that help with the former—by definition—undermine the latter? What impact does ICT have on the Chatham House Rule², a venerable cornerstone of Track 1 meetings?

ENCOURAGING PUBLIC DEBATE AND ENGAGEMENT

A key part of modern-day democratic constitution-building is a national conversation on the fundamental questions facing society. For countries recovering from protracted civil conflict, the airing of views and public debate can help the constitution drafters identify common values and visions of society, and support the national reconciliation process. However, the challenge of structuring debates around the constitution-making process by strategically leveraging ICTs is significant: too much noise can stymie the process and allow spoilers to run amok. Yet not using ICTs at all is no longer an option if a constitution-making process is to embrace public opinion, reach out to opinion makers and the media, and more generally be informed by public opinion via online fora as well as public meetings and rallies—all of which are largely conceptualized, framed, organized, recorded, perceived and disseminated through digital media.

² 'When a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the Chatham House Rule, participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed'. For further information, see <<https://www.chathamhouse.org/about/chatham-house-rule#sthash.7L9RA5h8.dpuf>>

KEYNOTE ADDRESSES

The first panel featured two opening keynotes on ‘Public domain information for participatory processes around governance’ by Sanjana Hattotuwa (Special Advisor, ICT4Peace) and on ‘Key challenges of constitution making today’ by Ekuru Aukot (UNDP Advisor to the Liberian Constitution Review Commission and former Director of the Committee of Experts on the Review of the Kenyan Constitution).

In the first keynote, Sanjana Hattotuwa discussed the key characteristics and functionalities of the internet, social media and mobile technologies, which promise resources for democratizing constitution-building processes worldwide. Sanjana described the (new) media landscape as the foundation for discursive terrains in many societies, which constitution-building process (CBP) experts should recognize and leverage. This overview covered the most popular social media platforms and illustrated how in some contexts, for example the use of Instagram in Sri Lanka, apps and platforms are being repurposed to promote advocacy, activism and dialogue.

Sanjana summarized ICTs’ contributions to socio-political and cultural production, dissemination and contestation, and flagged the enduring problem of discerning actionable intelligence from the tsunami of social media content.

Flagging the ‘Spectrum of Public Participation’ by the International Association of Public Participation, the presentation underscored the need for ICTs in CBPs to focus on the involvement, collaboration and empowerment of citizens, rather than serve as one-way information conduits or rudimentary, cosmetic consultative mechanisms.³

Ending on a note of caution, Sanjana noted the importance of engaging with the unlike minded (for example, spoilers, or those opposed to certain provisions in a constitution), and the challenges associated with engineering the recognition of, and engagement with, difference. Stressing a greater focus on the role and research around cognitive neuroscience as it applies to CBPs and peace-building, the work of social marketers and the role played by telecoms operators, the presentation ended with a quote from renowned author William Gibson, which highlighted that the responsibility of those assembled in the room was to disseminate and democratize knowledge regarding the use of technology in CBPs.

In his keynote, Ekuru Aukot detailed how a constitution-building process can be best architected, especially as a means of dealing with the aftermath of violence. He noted that constitution-building is often about addressing systemic problems after violence, and reordering society. He noted that constitution-building processes needed to embrace

³ On the ‘spectrum of public participation’ see <<http://www.iap2canada.ca/page-1020549>>

questions related to who participates, how to ensure the process of participation is democratic, and how to embrace youth and imagine their future. Anchored to the adoption and adaptation of ICTs, he flagged a number of challenges:

- the need for civic, political and constitutional education among the masses;
- how ICTs can help circumvent the political challenges in constitution-making today;
- how to deal with the divide between smartphone users and basic phone users, especially in regions where telephony is basic and connectivity is poor;
- how ICTs can work around poor telecommunication infrastructure, and
- what ICTs can do in the face of high illiteracy levels, sometimes over 80 per cent.

After the ignite talks (see Section 2 below), Sean Deely—Deputy Director of the Postwar Reconstruction and Development Unit, University of York, and formerly a Senior Recovery Advisor for the United Nations in Libya—chaired a session at the workshop on how the Internet and social media could be harnessed to promote meaningful participation in constitution-making. The session, co-chaired by Tarik Nesh-Nash, from GovRight, flagged the importance of considering realities regarding the use and availability of ICTs in the field. The scale of challenges in this regard, he said, was significant. ICT adoption in a context of violent conflict, multiple and competing languages, low literacy, varied topography, poor infrastructure, a democratic deficit and poor rule of law remains challenging. He also said the vast majority of people do not want to be engaged in an in-depth way in a CBP, yet needed to know the contours of the process and how (if and when they choose to do so) they could provide input into the process. Speaking about various ICT-enabled models around engagement, he spoke about the importance of collaboration and parallel drafting processes as well as ways to enhance public input into the official consultations around a CBP.

Questions about Sean’s introductory remarks were around what the ‘sweet spot’ would be, in various contexts, to make the broader population feel they were fully participating in a CBP. Sean did not address the nexus between cybersecurity and CBPs, in a global context where information security and the assurance of identity or anonymity is increasingly at risk from state and non-state actors. Pushing back on the assertions that ICTs were not helpful in many contexts was the question regarding what exactly was meant by ICTs, in which contexts, and how ICTs (at their most useful) were selected, crafted or adapted on the basis of real contextual needs, and not imposed based on pre-determined perceptions or interests.

In the concluding keynote, Malachy Browne, from Reported.ly, gave some fascinating insights into how social media, when carefully crafted around a specific goal in certain contexts, can generate actionable intelligence about what people are thinking, saying and doing. Used by journalists to figure out what is going on where at any given point in time, the same technologies could be used by those drafting a constitution to ascertain—close to real-time—public sentiment around key clauses, push back against certain provisions, and proactively generate public support for amendments or even a process of drafting a new constitution. Browne said it was now possible to perform data mining around public perceptions, and flagged some examples of how deliberative and collaborative platforms engineered for sharing computer code could be easily adapted for

a CBP or legislative reform. He stressed that technology and social media cannot simply be retrofitted around complex social processes, and that you need to be organically part of these processes in order to best fit the technology. He said that many people now naturally resided in social media, stressing the importance of harvesting public domain information around a CBP, keeping in mind the limitations on demography and ICTs' use in a particular context.

IGNITE TALKS

The ignite talks featured nine technology entrepreneurs presenting their newly developed tools with a view to their potential use in constitution-building processes, to increase citizens' access to information, enhance the transparency of the overall process, and/or encourage public debate.

Name of the technology: Code for Philly, a Code for America brigade
Presenter: Dawn McDougall (@de_mcdougs on Twitter)
What is it for: Code for Philly is a volunteer-based group of civic technologists. They use technology to provide technological solutions to social problems. They focus on the process by which the technology is built rather than the exact outcome. Through this process, civic engagement is increased and principles of constitution-building practices are leveraged. Civic technology is important to see how people think about issues, get input and create a sense of purpose, and develop citizen-led prototypes that may ultimately be adopted and implemented by government.
Where has it been used: Through the practice of civic tech, many important projects have emerged from the community, solving issues in the biking community, education, litter and trash, reintegration, mentorship and more. These technologies play a critical role in rewriting social contracts in an urban context and improving how citizens interact with local government. Code for Philly is a local chapter based in Philadelphia, PA, USA, but these efforts have extended across the country and internationally, to Germany, Japan, Australia, Mexico and several countries in Sub-Saharan Africa.
Why is it important: This process is fundamental for making real change happen by engaging people in governance and decision-making via citizen-led and citizen-built technologies.
More information: < http://codeforphilly.org >

Dawn McDougall from Code for Philly noted how civic tech and civic hacking is re-engineering both how governments work and how citizens interact with government. She spoke of using technology to improve government from within as well as from outside, and to strengthen governance as an act of citizenship. Civic hacking, she noted, was the process of rapid prototyping and rapid iteration of solutions to problems, including social problems. This requires several different skill sets, as well as the consciousness that collective intelligence and the confluence of ideas matters more than individual expertise. Civic hacking was undergirded by open data, which she said needed to be machine readable, and free to use and access. This data, coupled

with individuals—not all of whom need to have a background in computer coding or technology—could produce innovative solutions to long-standing civic challenges. This process, she also noted, helped build trust in government, and among the individuals involved in the process.

Questions that arose from the presentation were anchored to assumptions about the underlying technical and technological infrastructures that needed to be in place for the kind of civic hacking that was showcased, along with of course web, data and media literacy. Another question involved how civic hacking could be democratized, taking the principles of such engagement to the field and grassroots.

Name of the technology: Rooster Logic
Presenter: Suman Shakya (@sushak on Twitter)
What is it for: Rooster Logic is a Nepal-based ICT company focused on data mining, analysis and visualization through its REMO (Research and Monitoring) System, which is an android smartphone-enabled and tablet-compatible tool that helps users collect, aggregate and report on relevant data. REMO helps ascertain public opinion and monitor changes of opinion as further data are collected.
Where has it been used: Nepal
How has it been used: The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) used REMO to support national surveys on the constitution-building process, collecting and analysing data from all 75 districts, and all 240 Constituent Assembly member constituencies. It intends to collect data on a regular basis by creating 1,000 ‘touch-points’ throughout Nepal, which will provide data/information on a daily basis, allowing their continuous integration and analysis.
More information: < http://roosterlogic.com >

Suman Shakya from Nepal’s Rooster Logic highlighted the very different context in the Global South, where government was largely offline, and records were largely still retained and recorded in physical files. He flagged technology developed and deployed in the country around the constitution-building process that was local-language based, designed with mobile technologies in mind, and that resulted in a national survey of around 8,000 respondents in record time. Echoing a theme repeated in many of the ignite talks, he noted that technology could help gauge the pulse of a country through active engagement with the people.

Questions that arose from Rooster Logic’s presentation were around (the lack of) political will and whether decision-makers, even when confronted with public opinion, take into account what are often parochial and partisan views.

Name of the technology: Local Interventions Group
Presenter: Ravi Phuyal
What is it for: Local Interventions Group is a Nepal-based ICT company that has created a platform—Janata Sambidhan or Peoples’ Constitution—that allows users to upload the Nepali Constitution to leave comments, annotate specific sections and report their grievances online. The platform serves as an enabling tool for citizen feedback, bringing the constitution-making process straight to the citizens, and giving citizens a voice in the process.
Where has it been used: Nepal
How has it been used: As part of Nepal’s first citizen feedback loop regarding the constitution-making process, Local Interventions Group has recently concluded an innovative pilot in which citizens of two different districts—in Mahottari and Tanahun—used their mobile phones to report their grievances at the local level, enabling them to amplify their voices to demand better services from their government. This initiative was coordinated with the government at both the central and local levels, and used Ushahidi and mobile telephones as their implementation tools.
More information: < http://www.localinterventions.org.uk >

Ravi Phuyal from Nepal’s Local Interventions Group spoke to many of the same points as Suman Shakya regarding the context in which Nepal’s constitution was negotiated. In addition, he said technology encouraged trust in a constitution-making process; he showcased the Hamro Constitution Initiative, which married web and mobile-based deliberative platforms to channel feedback and opinions from those on the ground.

Discussion points around this presentation were anchored on how to best harmonize varied ICT platforms, tools, apps and services that were operational in a CBP, and how to best analyse sentiments expressed in local languages.

Name of the technology: Souktel Digital Solutions
Presenter: Maggie McDonough
What is it for: Souktel designs and delivers custom mobile solutions that connect job seekers with employers, and helps development implementers get information to and from the people they serve.
Where has it been used: Globally
How has it been used: On election day or at local meetings, Souktel’s digital solutions give a powerful voice to the voiceless. In the first elections after the Arab Uprisings, they helped ensure free and fair voting in Libya, Tunisia and Egypt through mobile exit polls and incident reporting. Souktel has also helped more than 250,000 Somalis get clear information about their new draft constitution through audio content hotlines. Souktel’s solutions are used daily by US Agency for International Development and UN projects around the world, and by regional media networks in the Middle East and Africa.
More information: < http://souktel.org >

Maggie McDonough from Souktel Digital Solutions spoke about how a few years ago, before the advent of modern 3G connectivity and smartphone telephony, the company had engineered a news and information service over basic SMS to increase public engagement. She cautioned that ICT tools supporting political processes are not a panacea in and of themselves, and noted that training is essential to properly use ICTs, along with outreach strategies to engage communities.

The central question around this presentation was on what some called ‘failing forward’—a culture of openly sharing failure (around, for example, pilot projects) that was instructive, and helped others avoid the same mistakes when implementing similar initiatives.

Name of the technology: Elva
Presenter: Mark van Embden Andres
What is it for: Elva is an Internet platform that allows local organizations to design and implement data-driven civic advocacy campaigns. From survey design to data visualization, Elva presents users with an end-to-end solution for citizen action on local issues of concern.
Where has it been used: Multiple countries/contexts
How has it been used: The Elva Platform combines a range of possible data collection tools for the design and dissemination of survey data via SMS, smartphone and web reports. These data can be collected from a virtually unlimited number of (citizen) respondents, from even the most remote and hard-to-reach areas. It uses interactive maps, dynamic graphs, data tables, at-a-glance overviews of key states, and photo and video reports on local needs and incidents. It has been used in a number of cases, ranging from public health to constitutional reform.
More information: < http://elva.org >

Mark van Embden Andres from Elva spoke to the importance of engagement, participation and data visualization, and began his ignite presentation with a quote from the Sri Lankan Kumar Rupesinghe: ‘information is useful if acted upon, and when the information so produced provides choices of action to policymakers.’⁴ He made the point that the very fact that ICT platforms were instantiated could lead to those who felt they were excluded from them to become, over time, spoilers in the larger process—obliquely strengthening what others before had said about the importance of public engagement. He also spoke about the dynamics of such public engagement, noting that in his opinion, payment to secure opinions from certain constituencies could work.

Related to some of the questions raised earlier, the discussion after this presentation was anchored on how the democratization of analysis could occur, noting that visualizations and data analysis were ideal if done by communities, within their own community, for communities.

⁴ See <<http://irevolution.net/2011/08/01/quest-for-disaster-early-warning/>>

Name of the technology: Al Bawsala
Presenter: Ons Ben Abdelkarim
What is it for: Al Bawsala is an Internet portal that assists citizens seeking political information, members of parliament (MPs) looking to embrace democratic and consultative practices, and associations that seek to ensure the rights of citizens.
Where has it been used: Tunisia
How has it been used: Al Bawsala has three objectives: (1) to reposition citizens at the core of political action by offering them the means to stay updated with their elected representatives and by providing them ways to defend their fundamental rights; (2) to build relationships with elected representatives and decision-makers in order to work towards the establishment of good governance practices and political ethics; and (3) to participate in defending the concepts of social progress and citizen empowerment. It uses three main programmatic strategies, including monitoring (observing legislative and executive proceedings, and promoting transparency and advocating), defending fundamental rights and individual freedoms, and empowering—assisting in the development of citizen initiatives.
More information: < http://www.albawsala.com >

Ons Ben Abdelkarim from Tunisia’s Al Bawsala presented on how technology had helped increase scrutiny of the country’s legislative body/Constituent Assembly, and how technology related to transparency had strengthened lawmaking.

Name of the technology: GovRight/Legislation Lab
Presenter: Tarik Nesh-Nash
What is it for: GovRight is an organization that provides citizens the opportunity to understand and actively contribute to their country’s legislative processes. Legislation Lab is an Internet portal aimed at supporting authentic citizen engagement on legislation, and is supported by GovRight’s expertise in the field of online participation.
Where has it been used: Globally
How has it been used: GovRight has been used in a number of different but related fields. <i>Access to law:</i> The publication of law documents and data in a format that is modern, accessible, and designed to be shared and integrated. <i>Civic education:</i> Applying educational methodology and technology to create citizens who better understand the function and effects of the legislation in their country. <i>Participation:</i> Creating opportunities for citizens to voice their knowledge and opinions on the purpose and implementation of legislation.
More information: < http://govright.org >

Tarik Nesh-Nash from GovRight began by noting that a country’s constitution is the supreme pact between its citizens and rulers. He noted that the current processes for authoring constitutions are anchored to a time when horses were the main mode of transportation. He then asked the participants to think of how, when the Internet, web and mobiles are almost ubiquitous, the processes of changing or drafting a constitution could also change. Who should write the constitution? How can citizens contribute to the draft? How can they add a new article, or change or remove an existing article? He explained that the focus should not be on technology but rather on impact, and how much ICTs contribute to authoring the constitution. He also cautioned that architects of ICT platforms and tools in a CBP needed to remain neutral and impartial. Local partners needed to drive the agenda of participation, and ICT architects only needed to share the tools and best practices—differentiating between advocacy and participation, and stressing that citizen participation in a CBP should not be a technology project. He saw public participation as a combination of expertise from international development, technology, law, political sciences, social sciences, and the media and anthropology.

Linked to the questions raised by the Al Bawsala presentation, some challenges raised in the discussion included how the mainstream media could be engaged in the work that resided primarily in web, Internet, and mobile domains or platforms. Another participant questioned how best to engage in a CBP without creating systemic, institutional or individual dependencies that are not sustainable over the longer term.

Name of the technology: DemocracyOS
Presenter: Felipe Muñoz
What is it for: DemocracyOS software allows citizens to increase their understanding of a certain topic. Using a simple interface, it enables anyone to access relevant information on a specific topic, build relevant arguments and debate, and vote on a specific issue.
Where has it been used: DemocracyOS has been released in Argentina, Brazil, France, Hungary, Mexico, Spain, the United States and many other places around the world. Since it is open-source software, it allows citizens worldwide to take the code from Github and adapt it to their needs for free.
How has it been used: DemocracyOS has evolved into one of the most used platforms for collaborative decision making and has been translated into 15 languages. It has been used, for instance, in Tunisia to debate its national constitution; by the Federal Government of Mexico to develop its open government policy; and by the Congress of Buenos Aires, which became the first example of digital democracy in the Americas. Political activists and other stakeholders have also used it to build political parties such as the Partido de la Red, clubs, student unions and government departments. DemocracyOS enables large-scale discussions on any topic.
More information: < http://democracyos.org >

Felipe Muñoz from Argentina’s *Democracia en Red* also talked about citizen empowerment through technology, and the importance of diversity and plurality in civic technology initiatives. He also flagged the importance of engaging different stakeholders, such as minorities or academics, to increase the legitimacy of any discussion. Like others before

he said ICTs in a CBP should not be just for technology enthusiasts but for all citizens, and emphasized the importance of a constitution-building process that includes both technology and face-to-face interactions.

The key question inspired by this talk was whether (and how) the systems and ideas proposed by *Democracia en Red* (that is, web-based as well as mobile-enabled participatory and deliberative frameworks) could work where there was a serious and perhaps growing democratic deficit, or in authoritarian regimes where the rule of law was suspect, with resulting challenges related to independent institutions and the freedom of expression.

Name of the technology: Manthri.lk
Presenter: Asoka Obeyesekere
What is it for: Manthri.lk is a pioneering trilingual website that, for the first time, profiles the actions and activities of all 225 MPs in Sri Lanka. As an MP-monitoring scorecard, Manthri.lk recognizes the need for accountability between MPs and their electorates. In doing so, it seeks to promote transparency and good governance in order to improve Sri Lanka's democratic framework.
Where has it been used: Sri Lanka
How has it been used: Manthri.lk ranks MPs on the basis of productive time spent, on a comprehensive collection of 42 topics based on an objective and impartial coding system. Topics range from foreign affairs and economic development to human rights and reconciliation. Manthri.lk collects its data from an in-depth analysis of the parliamentary Hansard, a verbatim record of parliamentary proceedings. The data captured are then entered into a detailed classification coding system that classifies the contributions and scores them against an objective concept of productive time spent in parliament.
More information: < http://www.manthri.lk >

Asoka Obeyesekere from Transparency International Sri Lanka spoke about the Manthri.lk platform, which he engineered. In addition to the technology, he spoke about the importance of using the public as the first validators of a consultation process; a smaller team could later verify the most pertinent points. In what could be termed 'bounded crowdsourcing', this could mean that domain experts would engage with ideas and content, generated by a broader public that had been up-voted by the community, ensuring that only the most pertinent, popular or important points would be considered. This process, for instance around governance reform or anti-corruption, could generate greater buy-in from the media and make such initiatives more relevant to those outside urban areas.

A challenge raised here was around how one could engineer CBPs that were hostage to the actions of spoilers, and how initiatives like Manthri.lk could be sustained over the long term, beyond the original reasons or context for developing the project or platform.

ANNEX A. AGENDA

Time	Description
8:30 – 9:00am	Registration
9:00 – 9:30am	Introduction (plenary)
9:30 – 10:00am	Keynote speeches: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ekuru Aukot, UNDP Advisor to the Liberian Constitution Review Commission and former Director of the Committee of Experts on the Review of the Kenyan Constitution: ‘Key challenges of constitution making today’ • Sanjana Hattotuwa, Special Advisor, ICT4Peace: ‘Public domain information for participatory processes around governance’
10:00 – 10:30am	Three ignite talks on ‘Access to Information’ (10 mins each) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code for Philly, by Dawn McDougall • Rooster Logic Pvt Ltd., by Suman Shakya • Local Interventions Group, by Ravi Phuyal
10:30 – 10:45am	Discussion and feedback
10:45 – 11:00am	Coffee break
11:00 – 11:30am	Three ignite talks on ‘Transparency in the Process’ (10 mins each) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Souktel Digital Solutions, by Maggie McDonough • Elva, by Mark van Embden Andres • Al Bawsala, by Ons Ben Abdelkarim
11:30 – 11:45am	Discussion and feedback
11:45 – 12:15pm	Three ignite talks on ‘Encouraging Public Debate’ (10 mins each) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GovRight/Legislation Lab, by Tarik Nesh-Nash • DemocracyOS, by Felipe Muñoz • Manthri, by Asoka Obeyesekere
12:15 – 12:30pm	Discussion and feedback

12:30 – 1:00pm	Key opportunities and the challenges moving forward. A wrap-up of the three ignite talk sessions and presentation of challenges for the tech community (by Sanjana Hattotuwa)
1:00 – 2:00pm	Buffet lunch and tech booth demonstrations (booths that display, demonstrate and explain each product)
2:00 – 3:00pm	How can the Internet and social media be harnessed to promote meaningful participation in constitution making? (chaired by Sean Deely, Tarik Nesh-Nash)
3:00 – 3:15pm	Keynote speech—Malachy Browne: ‘Embracing public domain information for constitution-building’
3:15 – 3:30pm	Q&A
3:30 – 3:45pm	Concluding remarks
3:45 – 4:00pm	Coffee break
4:00 – 5:00pm	In parallel: 1. Tour of the venue 2. Constitute demonstration (constitutional lawyers and those involved in constitution making, with Google Docs) – <i>starting at 3.45</i>
5:00pm onwards	Cocktail reception

ANNEX B. SYNTHESIS OF PROBLEM STATEMENTS FROM CONSTITUTION-BUILDING EXPERTS

CONTEXT OF MOST CONSTITUTION-BUILDING PROCESSES

1. polarized and tribalized political environment;
2. high illiteracy levels/poor media literacy;
3. post-conflict context (post-war, with enduring systemic conflict and a democratic deficit/contestation over accountability/fragile transitional justice mechanisms/residual power of former government or regime manifest as spoiler dynamics);
4. lack of capacity (technical/human/financial) within the lead agency tasked with constitution making;
5. poor infrastructure (roads, telecommunications, etc.);
6. dominant political party;
7. weak and fractured civil society;
8. parallel reform processes and the resulting lack of cohesion and collaboration;
9. partisan/absent mainstream media; and
10. dominant or increasingly prevalent use of social media by a younger, politically active, demographic.

BIG DATA

- the challenge of organizing and analysing large amounts of quantitative and qualitative data from public inputs in order to distil public sentiments for constitutional drafting.

ENGAGEMENT/REACH

- reach people through SMS for civic education and consultation;
- communicate with people who cannot read or write; and
- communicating best practices in constitutional design to stakeholders, and broadening participation in constitution making.

PARTICIPATION/COLLABORATION/DISCURSIVE FRAMEWORKS

- ways to ensure effective citizen participation and data processing in frequent debates that are geographically spread out on a wide variety of issues;
- a tool that concentrates the information into a single database, which can be used simultaneously in all the debates;

- a platform that provides the right kind of framework for collective editing, customized to the constitutional context, in which headings and article numbers are apparent; and
- a ‘participation app’ that can gather public input in mobile-intensive contexts.

ARCHIVAL/TRANSCRIPTION/TRANSLATION

- the challenge of archiving (in real time) views and comments from members of the public on draft constitutional texts that are up for discussion;
- transcribing proceedings of parliamentary debates/the Hansard, in real time or close to real time; and
- a cogent translation platform or service that lets outsiders offer comments and suggestions in local languages/vernacular during the drafting process.

ANALYSIS/DATA VISUALIZATION/MAPPING

- the challenges of comparing different draft constitutions up for discussion;
- map software to help address territorial cleavages; and
- a universal, high-tech constitution-making website with relevant analytical, historical and international resources to encourage constitution makers to be more outward looking.

ABOUT INTERNATIONAL IDEA

The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (International IDEA) is an intergovernmental organization that supports sustainable democracy worldwide. International IDEA's mission is to support sustainable democratic change by providing comparative knowledge, assisting in democratic reform, and influencing policies and politics.

WHAT DOES INTERNATIONAL IDEA DO?

In the fields of elections, constitution-building, political parties, gender in democracy and women's political empowerment, democracy self-assessments, and democracy and development, we undertake our work in three activity areas:

1. providing comparative knowledge derived from practical experience on democracy building processes from diverse contexts around the world;
2. assisting political actors in reforming democratic institutions and processes, and engaging in political processes when invited to do so; and
3. influencing democracy building policies through the provision of our comparative knowledge resources and assistance to political actors.

WHERE DOES INTERNATIONAL IDEA WORK?

International IDEA works worldwide. Based in Stockholm, it has offices in Africa, the Asia-Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean. International IDEA is a Permanent Observer to the United Nations.

<<http://www.idea.int>>



International IDEA
Strömsborg
SE -103 34 Stockholm
Sweden
Phone + 46 8 698 37 00
Fax + 46 8 20 24 22
Email: info@idea.int
Website: <http://www.idea.int>