APrIGF Macao 2015
Workshop Summary Report

Date: July 2, 2016
Time: 11:00-12:30
Workshop Title: Democracy 3.0: Constituency, Representation & the Multistakeholder Model
Reported by: Edmon Chung
Gender Balance (approx. number of female vs. male participants): ~
Moderators: Edmon Chung
Panelists:
Mr. Charles Mok, Legislative Council Member, HKSAR
Prof. HO Lok Sang, Lingnan University
Dr. Kenny Huang, Chairman, Mind Extension Inc.
Me. Jeremy Malcolm, Senior Global Policy Analyst, Electronic Frontier Foundation

A brief summary of presentations (If any)
e.g. Title & summary

Edmon Chung:
- The decline of "democracy" in recent years
    - What's gone wrong with democracy? (The Economist)
    - Political Decay (Francis Fukuyama)
    - "Democratators" ("Democratically" elected dictators)
- How multistakeholder Internet Governance model may inform new democratic theories
    - Stakeholder representation (vs. geographical constituencies)
    - Rough consensus concept
    - Nomination committees and deliberative democracy
- How Internet has changed policy debate and public engagement
    - Obama as the first US President with a single word campaign slogan: "Change" (2008) and "Forward" (2012).
    - Symbiosis of "meeting space" (from in person to online) and human behaviour

A substantive summary and the key issues that were raised:

Jeremy Malcolm:
- the multistakeholder model is just a way of bringing democracy into effect in places where the representational model doesn't work
- the more indirect representatives are selected, the weaker is the claim to democratic legitimacy (democratic deficits) of the committee/council/etc.

- policy laundering: governments negotiating international policies where local political will may not have supported such policies
- 2 key criticisms on multistakeholderism:
  - supports the status quo and supports the existing power of those who are already running, e.g. U.S. foreign policy masking a way of continuing the dominance of the U.S. and U.S. based corporations
  - just another word for self-regulation that is not accountable to the public. Just handing corporations the keys and antidemocratic because it allows companies to have a say in the rules
- what is our gold standard of multi-stakeholderism?
  - how are the stakeholders selected?
  - How are their interests balanced against each other?
  - What accountability mechanisms exist?
  - Is the forum an empowered space where changes can actually be made?
  - how is the input from the multistakeholders linked back to bodies that can put those changes into action?
  - how are these multistakeholder opinions balanced and how are they put into practice?
- what if they don't all have an equal stake in the condition under consideration because the interest of different stakeholder groups might vary from one issue to another. What happens if one stakeholder group happens to be twice as large as another stakeholder group in terms of the number of participants?
- deliberative democracy is designed to neutralize power imbalances.
- deliberative democracy is not about how many people are in favor of a particular decision, it's about how persuasive they are. And you have to persuade other people through the force of reason without having any advantage in terms of power or status in numbers.

Prof. Ho Lok Sang
- elections really do not give us the answers
- adversarial democracy is not going to work because it is going to break trust as politicians in order to be elected need to sort of "bribe" their way into election
- leaders and the decision makers have to guard the public interest by considering the interest of each and every member of the community
- "Representation" is for leaders not to put themselves in the shoes of each member of the community (but just their constituency)
- I personally do not believe in multi-party competition. You just need one party, and you need all of the eyes focused on those people who are in power to make sure that they do not abuse their power.

Kenny Huang
- Taiwan sunflower movement in response to the legislature's approval of a special agreement. The point is not the agreement itself, but that due process was not well organized.
- People demand transparency.

- Technical limitations/specifications of mobile technologies are unable to support spontaneous (unplanned) people movements (and such governance issue may require a multistakeholder approach)
- Quote, "The only way to deal with an unfree world is to become so absolutely free that your very existence is an act of rebellion."

Charles Mok

- The fundamental question that the citizens were trying to discuss and consider were whether or not there were equal nomination rights and whether there was screening of candidates prior to being put to the citizens for the popular vote.
- an electoral democracy is not an ideal system. I don't think we can replace it or we should he place it with an even more unfair election system.
- you have to study it because you see that there is similarity with multi-stakeholderism, and I think that's a very interesting thing that we need to study more.
- the young people of today, they have a strong wil to control their own destiny.
- And not the same kind of performance or quality that previous generations would be more accustomed to follow. They feel that there are a lot of societal problems because of global economic issues the widening poverty gap and lack of upwards mobility.
- how do you weight between different industrial or commercial sectors?
- they tend to have very, very narrow scope of things they are interested in.
- we should also study and consider whether or not it will bring more adversary because everybody is interested in their own interest. So I think multi-stakeholderism in its name is very good, you know, when we think about multistakeholders, every stakeholder should have their right and their authorities and their representation and so on, but in reality, how do we make it really work?
- I think Democracy 3.0 is to be more similar to 1.0 rather than going the other way because the only problem with 1.0 at the time was that it was not very efficient, but with technology, can we make it more efficient?
- If people lose faith in political parties, you know, how can we believe that they would necessarily be able to gain more faith in totalitarian party?

Audience:

- not one constituency can make a better decision.
- Willingness to share the power and empower the communities are not enough, it must have a process that is a reasonable and workable
- if every constituency only thinking about their own interest and not the public interest, the whole community interest is lost
- Democracy Kills Democracy with Overexploitation of Loopholes in System
- In Asia, villagers are not educated. Most of them are poor people. Corruption is widespread.
- when it comes to democracy, nobody has the monopoly for public interest.
- how do you scale multistakeholder model?
- this is what we learned in Thailand. First of all, we copied the American Constitution. It didn't work. Government is democracy, but not the way it should have been. Two, we came from a multiparty structure. When we had a national, we had over 50 parties, you don't know who to pick, but they represented all of the groups in the country. And we did away with that with only two parties like the Americans. As you saw, stalemate, nothing could

happen, the military had to intervene, not because we want another Coup, but because there was no way to utilize the adversarial democracy. So Thailand is in a jam. Where do we stand? We like multistakeholder, we like democracy, but we can't find a solution.

- so many places in the world, especially Developing Countries, we have to find a better way, a model still based on democracy. So I like what you say, and I think it chimes very well with Thailand
- we don't want parties too. we don't trust them. But I don't know about moving away from multiparty
- what we need local is flat, with local flat frameworks and open leaders.
- different versions serve different democracies

Conclusion & Further Comments:

- There are many forms of multistakeholder models, not all of them are equal
- Stakeholder groups and representation presents a challenge both for weighting and the narrow interest it sometimes tend to try to represent
- Further study on different multistakehodler models is important, including their accountability and decision making processes
- Whether multistakeholder model is democratic or not depends on the form it takes and how its members deliberate and make decisions
- The multistakehodler model is relevant for discussion of democratic systems