WHAT SHOULD THE CITIZENS BE ABLE TO DECIDE ON EU LEVEL?

Topics not to be crowdsourced at the EU level
- taxes;
- budget;
- issues undermining core EU values;

Because they might be emotionally driven and therefore manipulated.

What topics / issues to crowdsource at the EU level
- common topics of the EU concern (such as EU values);
- topics relating to the real decisions to be made at the EU level and for which the people should have their say;
- topics which are simple and easy to understand (however the danger of oversimplifying should be avoided);
- ad hoc topics when something very important happens and impacts peoples lives;
- general topic of people's interest: education framework, quality of food, health, security of the EU, military issues;
- specific topics under EU Commission competences: digital technologies/ information society (privacy, trust), Horizon 2020 topics, environment regulation;
- topics not being discussed elsewhere (e.g. Debate Europe, Your Voice in Europe);
- topics relating to the European Citizens Initiative.

Regardless the topics itself, it is important that these topics have an attachment to the people's experience, so they can also find these relationship bonds between the European legislation and the impact to their everyday life.

Crowdsourcing aims
- testing of opinions / getting opinions to co-decide with the European Commission in the early stage of policy-making;
- refining the issues from idea to the policy proposal.

Crowdsourcing requirements
- people should feel they can influence the outcomes of crowdsourcing;
- proper communication with people engaged into crowdsourcing;
- user experience with the crowd sourcing tool is important.

Open issues / questions relating to crowdsourcing at the EU level
- how to ensure the representative sample of people / European nations participating;
- what is the originality of wisdom of the crowd (what is the added value of the crowd in relation to the experts knowledge)?
- the fake-news issue, which can capture the crowd (crowd needs to be safeguarded).

IS THERE A RIGHT TIME & PLACE FOR CROWDSOURCING TO HAVE POLITICAL IMPACT?

In the workshop, we asked the participants in which phase of EU policy-making would a crowdsourcing experience make sense according to them.

We briefly explained how the European decision-making process works and the functions of

the EU institutions:

- The European Commission has the right of initiative and considered an autonomous promoter of the community interest;
- The European Parliament is composed of the direct representatives of the citizens;
- The Council of the EU holds the negotiations of national interests.

We also explained that there are four main entry points in legislative procedures - Ideas, Planning, Decision-making and Implementation - and we asked the participants in which phase of do they think crowdsourcing processes should take place.

Most of the participants agreed that a Crowdsourcing experience at the EU level should certainly be during the Ideas phase, especially to gather broad inputs from citizens from all parts of society. In the Ideas phase, the questions should not be too technical so that citizens can feel free to answer on the topic according to their knowledge and personal experience.

However, although the Ideas phase is a good one to ask for the "wisdom of the crowd", it is important that citizens are also involved in the next phases too as impact needs to be somewhere ensured. For example in the case of France's participatory mechanisms, citizens can contribute to the Ideas phase then contribute again in a later stage when there is a draft legislative text and citizens have possibility to have a say on the text itself. At the second stage, citizens are usually also more aware of the policy topic because of their involvement in the ideas phase.

The participants agreed France's case could be a good example to follow when piloting a crowdsourcing project at the EU level too.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE RIGHT TECHNOLOGY FOR CROWDSOURCING AT THE EU LEVEL?

Participants together with workshop moderators concluded, that there are already a few good crowdsourcing platforms – some of them in Finland, France and Latvia, where a person can read, vote and comment on law proposals on the platforms. Partly from experience of these and also other well known examples, participants came to the definitions of the necessary requirements, risks and problems as well as the ownership of the desired technological solution for the EU level pilot platform.

Requirements:
- Optional anonymity (higher risk of cyber attacks);
- Open source solution;
- Great user experience;
- Quick response time.

Risks & problems:
- Internet "trolls", that could disturb the discussions;
- Cyber attacks - appropriate and safe authorisation level, as well as technical system should be ensured to prevent this risk;
- Contemporary trends of the internet should be taken advantage of (for example, video trend amongst the youth);

ManaBalss.lv
20.12.2017.

Answering the questions - who should own this kind of platform - the group concluded that it should be a hybrid form of ownership (state institution + ngo).