IGF 2016 Workshop Report Template

Session Title	Stanford University - Prototyping a Deliberative Tooklit for Multistakeholder Governance
Date	Dec. 5, 2016
Time	13:00 – 17:00
Session Organizer	Alice Siu
Chair/Moderator	Max Senges
Rapporteur/Notetaker	Kathleen Giles
List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations	James Fishkin, Stanford University Jackie Kerr, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Jeremy Malcolm, EFF
Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):	One key issue discussed was the Deliberative Polling Deliberative Polling methodology and how it could be used by the IGF community. A second key issue discussed was encryption governance.
If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each Presentation	The first presentation was an overview of the Deliberative Polling methodology including how participants would engage in a mini deliberation using briefing materials on the topic of encryption governance. Deliberative Polling, created by Professor James Fishkin and a speaker at the workshop, takes a random, representative sample of a population and engages them in deliberations on a set of issues and gathers their informed opinions in confidential questionnaires. A deliberative toolkit using the balanced briefing materials on the topic of encryption was also discussed. This alternative format to a Deliberative Poll engages participants in discussions that are shortened to fit the time constraints of multistakeholder events. In both cases the briefing materials used as the basis for the discussions are vetted by a committee of experts, provides a place for deliberation in depth about the options and trade-offs. It also allows netizens to think about and reflect upon their opinions. The second portion of the workshop was interactive with the participants, they engaged in small group discussions on the topic of encryption governance. The participants were provided balanced briefing materials presenting a range of potential policy options and arguments in favor and against these options. The small groups were moderated by trained moderators in the Deliberative Polling method. Following this small group discussion, the conversation then turned to a broader discussion of multistakeholder internet governance and how it could be improved by using tools such as a deliberative toolkit. The speakers considered questions of how can and how should we govern a global resource like the online space?; and how can stakeholders participate on equal footing and in their respective roles? The application of deliberative democracy to this space was discussed.

Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session: (3 paragraphs)	Participants in the session discussed the topic of encryption governance in small groups. They focused on the technical challenges that are present and the difficulty in bringing the public into this debate given the technical nature of the issue. However, the participants also noted the human rights aspects present in this debate in addition to the technical side. The discussion also looked at what institutions and forums should engage in this kind of deliberative discussion on encryption governance. It was noted that human rights are contested in this space,and historically there have been events that shift the views on this issue and change the debate like September 11, 2001. It was also noted that there are standards being implemented by groups like IETF, but then the question of who policies those standards is not clear. Lastly, the discussion looked at the difficulties presented to law enforcement by allowing backdoors in devices or technology and that discussions in settings like the IGF do not necessarily reach those who would exploit weaknesses in this tech. There was also discussion of the roles of various governments and other actors who might influence this debate given their resources or current involvement in the discussion. The participants noted that the debate is still focused too much on the United States (especially with regards to the Apple v. The FBI case) and that the broader global view should be taken.
Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways: (3 paragraphs)	The participants provided valuable insights into how best to revise the current briefing materials on encryption governance to add in some of the technical challenges that are present. Additionally, they suggested taking a more global view of the problem and trying to move away from presenting on the US point of view. The project team plans to meet with various experts who were at this workshop and others in order to better understand some of the views that are currently missing from the materials. The team plans to engage with the technical and corporate community as a result of connections made during this workshop. The toolkit approach to deliberations with stakeholders was well received and can be iterated on in other venues. The team plans to refine this process and create such a tool that could enhance multistakeholder internet governance.