How We Failed to Make an Online Deliberation Tool

Experience from sense.tw

Yun-Chen Chien
@aelcenganda
Oct. 30 2019 @DecidimFest
CC BY 4.0 International
Self-intro

Former product manager of sense.tw
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Open Collaboration

Decentralized. Open as default. Everybody can contribute.
Online2offline collaboration
sense.tw
Issue Policy Mapping Tool
Online Deliberation Tool
Project results

1. Issue mapping tool-sense.tw:
   ~120 users
   ~200 annotations

2. Online participation guideline
   ~500 reads

3. Tech community interested topics
   ~70 communities
   ~20 community issues

4. Tech policy meetup:
   ~10 meetup

5. Research report
As startup team to build new product

Director: hychen
Senior Engineer: pm5
Cloud Engineer: Yen-Wen
Front-end Engineer: caasi
UI/UX Designer: Kanail
Product Manager: ael
Intern: Ya-jun
1. Understand stakeholders and their goals
1. Bottom-up discussion on 2030 technology visions
2. Bottom-up communication platform for technology policy
Bottom-up discussion
=> Organized external insights
They don’t care about tools
2. What are the existing mechanism and where are the gaps?
Online participation scenes in Taiwan:
We don’t want to build another platform

---

JOIN.tw

Participation Officers Network

vTaiwan

National Judicial Reform

Energy White Paper

---

Gov initiate

General Topic

Citizen

Specific Issue
PO meeting

03
I think sharing economy is the trend, so government should modify regulations instead of banning every sharing economy service.

91% of those in group B who voted on statement 0 agreed.
vTaiwan

Issue → Qualify issue → Stakeholder discovery

[Hackpad]

Typeform

Discourse

GitBook

Participants ask questions
Competent agencies respond

Interpretate and explain terminologies
Online deliberation
Comment curation

Educate populations
Face to face dialogue
Transcript

slido

slideshare

research and identify more stakeholders through rolling questionnaires

Identify affected and knowledgeable populations

LIVEhouse.in

YouTube
1. Deeper and informed discussion
2. Focus on expert meeting
3. Bring in technology communities’ insights
3. Testing annotation tool on expert consultancy meeting
projects

The civil society organisation Obshtestvo.bg Foundation has been pressing as well as helping the government to incorporate open source in its legislation. Open source is now the preferred developer of eGovernment projects. The Bulgarian Council of Ministers has voted that the same requirements will apply to all government-funded software projects.

Open source is one of our strategic goals, says Dimitar Dimitrov, a Bulgarian software developer who has been involved in civil activities for quite some time.

Public software

We have been thinking about current problems in the government and eGovernment, Dimitrov continues, searching for inspiration from other countries and governments. We found that in Ben Balter’s blog, the UK Digital Service (GDS), 18F, the US Digital Service (USDS), and others.

We concluded that when government is commissioning contractors to develop or integrate software solutions with public funds, these projects should be made open source under a permissive license, preferably one. Obshtestvo.bg wants these projects to be developed as an open source project from the start. This is to fight the current behind-the-curtains, no-public-control way of building software for the government, Dimitrov explains.

The group argues that, since the government usually does not have the capacity, the technical skills and/or: properly verify the work performed by a software contractor, the technical community could do that if these projects made public. Other reasons to move away from closed source software are the high risks of vendor lock-in, and re-use between software projects paid with public funds. And there are many more.

Preliminary criteria

In 2014, Obshtestvo.bg started a campaign, explaining this position to the public. The campaign attracted nearly a thousand supporters.

The group got in touch with Vassil Velichkov, who was working with the interim government on the Operational “Good Governance” (OPGG) 2014-2020. They helped him with ideas and suggested ways to make open source projects an eligibility criterion for the list of eGovernment projects. It paid off, concludes Dimitrov.
No one used it.

Does the tool only serve for government use?
4. Re-identify challenges to generate community discussion

Expert meeting

\[\rightarrow\] Community discussion and insights to be brought into expert meeting
如何讓政府與民間的溝通產生對科技政策的建設性意見
How to organize and input technology community constructive insights in early policy making process?

We also develop 4 personas and 4 scenarios with intense interviews. Tool should be used by the community!
1. Discussion based on references
2. Breakdown arguments and supporting info
3. Visual concept map
The civil society organisation Obshtestvo.bg Foundation has been pressing as well as helping the government to incorporate open source in its legislation. Open source is now the preferred development method for eGovernment projects. The Bulgarian Council of Ministers has voted that the same requirements will apply to all government-funded software projects.

Open source is one of our strategic goals, says Dimitar Dimitrov, a Bulgarian software developer who has been involved in civil activities for quite some time.

Public software

We have been thinking about current problems in the government and eGovernment, Dimitrov continues, when searching for inspiration from other countries and governments. We found that in Ben Baltzer’s blog, the UK Digital Service (GDS, 18F), the US Digital Service (USDS), and others.

We concluded that when government is commissioning contractors to develop or integrate software solutions, they should be made open source under a permissive license, preferably one that allows commercial use. Obshtestvo.bg wants these projects to be developed as an open source project from the start. This is the only way to fight the current behind-the-curtains, no-public-control way of building software for the government, Dimitrov explains.

The group argues that, since the government usually does not have the capacity, the technical skills and/or properly verify the work performed by a software contractor, the technical community could do if these projects were made public. Other reasons to move away from closed source software are the high risks of vendor lock-in, and re-use between software projects paid with public funds. And there are many more.

Preliminary criteria

In 2014, Obshtestvo.bg started a campaign, explaining this position to the public. The campaign attracted nearly a thousand supporters.

The group got in touch with Vassil Velichkov, who was working with the interim government on the Operativ “Good Governance” (OPGG) 2014-2020. They helped him with ideas and suggested ways to make open source part of the ‘Preliminary criteria for the eligibility of eGovernment projects’. It paid off. concludes Dimitrov. Now a
公共採購軟體開源

推廣策略

行政院工程會的資訊採購範圍

有商業商標產品清單，應依照
開源軟體之授權範圍，授權機
構利用

哪一種授權比較適合？

商標不適用於開源商標名稱，出處資
訊、版權優先權利贈與等，免責聲明、
開源授權條款標示等全文。
No one used it.
Hard to understand.
Hard to operate.
5. Create use cases and scenarios
G0v projects
網路中立性是什麼？

網路中立性是一個原則，要求所有網路流量均應被平等對待[7]。

網路中立性是什麼？

網路中立性是一個原則，要求所有網路流量均應被平等對待[7]。
Nuclear Power Plant Debate
黃士修：

各位朋友，我們這次推動以核養綠公投，要把電業法的2025非核家園條款給廢除掉。 donc. 進黨政府執政以來，已經造成了缺電、漲價，以及環境生態的破壞。

所以，我們認為這確實是你們支持這檔事，還是反對核能。我們認為你不應該在2025年這個這麼早的時間點廢除這條條文。因為他們發現過去民進黨在執政時期，他們稱「非核家園是他們心目中的一個乾淨國。」可是，民進黨執政之後，卻發現現在的生態，我們的溼地、埤塘、藻礁、濕地，一個一個被侵犯。但是，我們國民的一些環保團體對這件事情坐視不管，他們國民黨的廢除的政策。ина 事實查核
締盟：非核減煤 不必再核義
觀塘換深澳電廠？締盟：非核減煤不需犧牲藻礁生態
蔡中岳：非核減煤不必犧牲藻礁

真相揭露
再生能源過去的擴張真的不傷害環境嗎？
國士三法與知本溼地
非核減煤不增氣，用甚麼來電？
農地種電 立委：政策該人
非核家園過頭？農田全種「電」 農民怒喊徹！
知本溼地建太陽電 深澳抗議陣地抵抗生態
埤塘徵收政策的影響 議員要求縣府盡速展開救災
離岸風力發電干擾白海豚 環團、漁會聯合抗議

所以，在公投推動的過程中心，這些生態團體急於找我們求助，我們在他們的眼神中，看到了一種哀傷。我們認為，即使是反對核能的，你們也都應該在棄台中央的廢除的政策，我們在你們的價值。所以，士修要在這邊呼籲各位，我們應該要把2025非核家園，也就是電業法第95條第1項全部廢除掉。

那有一些朋友可能就會問說，「阿這個你們要怎么2025非核家園廢掉，那你們說以核養綠」。
Some used it.
More people read and understand it.
Still not user-friendly and we had no time.
6. Write report and research paper

Very different mindsets and understanding of the project
Lessons learned
Goals & Timeline

Government timeline

1. Project starts
2. Online participation guideline & mechanism
3. National Technology Assembly
4. Top 50 Tech community list and issues
5. Design Sprint
6. Prototype
7. Development
8. Alpha
9. Beta
10. Got Funding
11. Interviews online participation guideline
12. Collect tech communities profiles
13. Tech policy meetups
14. Research paper
15. 2030 Tech Vision White Paper

OUR TEAM

Our real timeline: we want to develop a product. We are only serving the government. We want to build a mechanism.
Expectations

GOVERNMENT

OUR TEAM
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On tool development

- Smaller MVP + clear user needs
- More iteration on user testing instead of user interviews
- Usability first
- Create and promote new use cases and it takes time
- General purpose tool and modules are better than specific framework

On project

- Do we choose the wrong direction that the main goal is to build a tool instead of a mechanism?
- Is the product suitable to be put under government sponsored project?
- It is hard to push tool usage from outside than inside.
- Sense.tw server is closed now
What we left: fill the knowledge gap

- Agile software development model under government projects
- Interviews and online participation guidelines for tech communities and government
- Generate tech policy meetups and discussion