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About this document

The purpose of this report is to provide a literature review related to Open Government. The contents do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Simon Fraser University, the Government of Canada or the authors.

This report is published under the Open Government License – Canada 2.0. You are free to copy, modify, publish, translate, adapt, distribute or otherwise use the Information in any medium, mode or format for any lawful purpose. Credit should be attributed to Simon Fraser University’s Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue. Any works referring to this material should cite:


Funding to produce this literature review was provided by Canada’s Open Government Team through a professional services contract.
1 Introduction

Canada’s Fourth Biennial Plan to the Open Government Partnership, scheduled to be released in July 2018, presents an opportunity to help strengthen the Federal Government’s engagement with communities of interest who are often under-represented in traditional government processes.

Open Government is critical to engaging citizens and stakeholders meaningfully in policy and decision-making so that citizens and stakeholders can:

- expect that information is open by default to increase accountability and, ultimately, public trust;
- understand how tax dollars have been spent and how fiscal decisions have been made in the spirit of transparency;
- use government data to improve the lives of Canadians and to support innovation, prosperity and sustainable development; and
- meaningfully interact with and participate in democracy, knowing that their voices have been heard and considered.

Typically, these conditions for meaningful participation are disproportionately available to those with a high level of resources, education and engagement, or at least familiarity with government systems. In turn, citizens and stakeholders who are typically not well-served by standard government processes for engagement and information sharing face various and often multiple barriers, including but not limited to those related to personal means, literacy, language, power structures, discrimination, lived experience or personal context.

A significant amount of scholarly attention has been devoted to the particular topic of Open Government Data, its provisions by governments and its utilizations and conditions (Safarov et al., 2017) but much less so to the topic of inclusion in Open Government. For example, Safarov et al. (2017) describe two of the most recent systematic literature reviews on Open Government data. The first, by Attard, Orlandi, Scerri, and Auer, aims to assess Open Government initiatives and
describes the life-cycle of Open Government Data, while the second, by Hossain, Dwivedi, & Rana conducts a comprehensive systematic review about the insights from extant studies and provide a research agenda for future studies.

In this review, we will aim to focus on a thematic analysis of inclusion and accessibility for Open Government users, based on scholarly work and credible practitioner resources on public engagement, Open Government and inclusion.

2 Methodology

2.1 Data Sets

A comprehensive scan of the following literature databases was undertaken through the SFU library system as well as the University of London’s online library:

- CBCA Complete
- Canada's reference and current events - scholarly journal articles, trade publications, dissertations, books, newspapers and magazines.
- eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)
- ELDIS Gateway to Development Information
- By Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex (U.K). Includes research & policy documents on ageing, population, climate change, corporate social responsibility, debt relief, food security, gender, globalization, health and more.
- Google Scholar
- Oxford Bibliographies Online
- Social Sciences Full Text
- Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts with Full Text (LISTA)
- SFU Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue Internal Knowledge Base
2.2 Key words

Open Government, Open Data, e-government, inclusion, under-served communities, users, LGBTQ+, women, immigrants, newcomers, marginalized populations, participation, public engagement, digital divide, barriers to access.

2.3 Selection criteria

1. We only considered peer-reviewed articles that were written in English language and accessible through academic libraries, as well as documents prepared by organizations and think tanks with extensive experience in public engagement.
2. Studies, articles and documents specifically pertaining to Open Government and Open Data were taken into account, as well as case-studies and reports on government public engagement.
3. Dimensions around inclusion and citizen participation were taken into account, even when not explicitly associated with Open Government, particularly in relation to barriers to participation.
4. All studies pertained to countries with well-developed economies and democratic institutions that are currently developing Open Government principles and tools, to maximize comparability to the Canadian context.

2.4 Relevance of studies and articles

As the scan of databases was undertaken, it became evident that there was a shortage of resources explicitly about under-served communities and Open Government that would be directly applicable to the Canadian context. Most of the literature pertaining to under-served communities focused on the digital divide and access to broad-band internet and computers, as well as skills and competence. Very few resources examined the interaction of under-served communities with Open Government initiatives, be they Open Data, Open Information or Open Dialogue. To better address the topic of inclusion, we focused additional attention on barriers to access and solutions to improve the participation of traditionally under-served communities in public engagement initiatives.
3 Thematic analysis: inclusion in Open Government and public engagement

The following themes are used to present the results of the literature review in relation to inclusion and accessibility in Open Government:

- The current state of Open Government: setting the stage for better inclusion
- Good practices and limitations for accessibility in Open Data and Open Information
- Partnerships and Open Dialogue as an enabling factor for Open Government
- Institutionalizing a more mature Open Government model

3.1 The current state of Open Government: setting the stage for better inclusion

The OECD defines Open Government as the “opening up of government processes, proceedings, documents and data for public scrutiny and involvement. [It] is now considered as a fundamental element of a democratic society. Both greater transparency and public participation can not only lead to better policies and services, they can also promote public sector integrity, which is essential to regaining the trust of citizens in the neutrality and reliability of public administrations.”

There is an intersection and, often times, confusion between Open Data, Open Government and e-Government. Most activities and projects regarding Open Government Data are usually data-driven, offer a relatively homogeneous approach to citizen-government interactions and limit citizens’ understanding of complexities of issues and policies or their participation in relevant policy debates (Evans and Campos, 2013). Therefore, although they are related, e-government, Open Government, Open Data, and Big Data should be treated as different topics. Gurin (2014) illustrates types of Open Data concerning intersection to Open Government and Big Data:
The “Open Government Maturity Model” developed by Lee et al. (2012) implies that open participation and open collaboration of the citizenry are essential to achieve greater public value from Open Government. It defines five maturity levels of Open Government: initial conditions, data transparency, open participation, open collaboration and, finally, ubiquitous engagement (Lee et al., 2012). This model reflects how Meijer et al. (2012) describe Open Government as not only being about openness in informational terms (vision) but also about openness in interactive terms (voice). Where governments have been relatively successful at implementing steps to bring the vision of Open Government to life, including opening data and increasing overall government transparency, the citizen voice needed for a true Open Dialogue is often lacking. (Safarov et al., 2017). Simply relying on the use of Open Data may not be sufficient to ensure the full participation of members of the citizenry who may encounter barriers in accessing government services and data. The inclusion of these often forgotten voices in collaborative decision-making processes will require meaningful, thoughtful and effective public engagement.
Governments have traditionally used consultations as their main avenue for soliciting citizen feedback on policies and programs. Woodford describes how, during the mid- and late-1990s participation scholars and practitioners as well as citizens began criticizing consultation, with citizen engagement entering the field toward the end of that decade. Policy think tanks such as the Canadian Council on Social Development and the Canadian Policy Research Networks began highlighting the problems with consultation and advocating for meaningful participation through citizen deliberation (Woodford and Preston, 2013).

“Citizen engagement involves a commitment to the active involvement of citizens in policy-making through citizen deliberation, with deliberation aiming to provide government with an in-depth understanding of citizens’ perspectives and values. In contrast, traditional consultation methods only capture opinions and do not provide a rich understanding of citizen perspectives and ideals.” (Woodford and Preston, 2013). Both authors further analyze the common pitfalls of consultations or ineffective public engagement: one-way communication, infrequent feedback, limited involvement, poor representativeness, consultation being government-controlled and consultation having little or no effect on policy decisions (Woodford and Preston, 2013).

Many practitioners and scholars of public engagement have developed sets of guiding values and principles. Among the most well-known of these are the Core Values of the International Association for Public Participation, which speak to the need to seek out and facilitate “the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision” and seek “input from participants in designing how they participate.” The Government of Canada’s existing Public Engagement Principles speak even more directly to issues of inclusion: “We engage with people who have a range of views and perspectives that reflect the diversity within Canada. We reduce barriers to participation, whether physical, cultural, geographical, linguistic, digital, or other. We offer a variety of channels and methods through which to engage.”
3.2 Good practices and limitations for accessibility in Open Data and Open Information

Janssen et al. (2012) discuss citizen participation and self-empowerment as one of the political and social benefits of open public data. They define Open Data as “non-privacy-restricted and non-confidential data which is produced with public money and is made available without any restrictions on its usage or distribution”. However, the authors warn that “an infrastructure is necessary which helps users to make sense of data, and institutional measures are necessary to ensure public engagement. Under these conditions, open data can potentially go beyond the current level of citizen engagement and could result in a continuous dialogue between governments and their constituents, drawing upon the collective intelligence of the public” (Jansen et al., 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five myths of Open Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The publicizing of data will automatically yield benefits;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All information should be unrestrictedly be publicized;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is a matter of simply publicizing public data;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Every constituent can make use of Open Data and;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Open Data will result in Open Government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jansen et al. (2012)

Temiz and Brown (2017) highlight how the public sector plays a critical role, not only in opening datasets but also in providing incentives and developing accessibility measures. Accessibility measures, training and digital literacy support are therefore necessary to ensure that under-served communities have access to Open Government tools and initiatives. The authors go as far as to argue that a government can be open without involving Open Data, just by the virtue of being transparent and accessible.

In the collection of essays Open Government: Collaboration, Transparency, and Participation in Practice (Lathrop, 2010), Jones and Harper argue that participatory government relies on public trust, especially the trust of people who usually distrust the government, the Internet, or both. Among the suggestions made by the authors are data minimization (government will collect only information required for completing a service and will delete it once the task is completed),
anonymous access that will allow individuals to inquire about a personal matter without disclosing personal information, or minimal disclosure of information between agencies.

Safarov et al. (2017) warn that the trust of citizens can only be achieved if the data released is of high quality and as complete as possible. The accountability of government relies on the accuracy and reliability of data sets scrutinized by citizens. These issues of trust and privacy can be heightened for traditionally under-served communities, particularly those from communities that may have been marginalized. Privacy can be intertwined with safety and security issues for such users and they may fear that by accessing certain data, services or engagements, they could be identified or in certain cases “outed”.

Yu and Robinson (2012) elaborate on these issues: “even for voluntary government disclosures, increased privacy risk may be a fundamental objection to these new technologies: The more easily disparate sources of information can be analyzed, combined, and cross-referenced, the greater the chance that previously pseudonymous information can be tied to the identities of real people. On the other hand, a rush to limit adaptability to reduce the risk of privacy harms could create a ‘tragedy of the data commons,’ in which privacy fears foreclose valuable new insights into public issues.”

The Sunlight Foundation calls for “non-discrimination” to who can access data and how they are able to do so. Barriers to use of data can include registration or membership requirements. Another barrier is the uses of “walled garden,” which is when only some applications are allowed access to data. At its broadest, non-discriminatory access to data means that any person can access the data at any time without having to identify him/herself or provide any justification for doing so. Another principles, “ease of access”, relates not only to technical design and the means to download data in bulk, but also to “findability” so that accessing information through websites is not long and tedious (Sunlight Foundation).

Hellberg and Hedstrom (2015) developed the idea of “The myth of public interest in the re-use of open public data”. Although Open Data is widely recognized by the public as a good idea, there is a lack of engagement with the data or initiatives that may be explained by the following: (1) that
few people have the required skills; (2) that it is difficult for people to engage on issues beyond the sphere of local government; and (3) that there are not enough incentives for skilled individuals to use or share Open Data. Hellberg and Hedstrom argue that Open Public Data should not only be considered as an economic asset that can contribute to new products, services and efficiency, but that they should also be considered as a key driver to promote transparency and increase citizen participation in political and social life.

The most urgent needs of communities can sometimes be understood by looking at the popularity of certain types of Open Data sets. This may provide an opportunity for governments to understand and prioritize needs of residents (Kassen, 2013). From this observation, it can be inferred that the most urgent needs of traditionally under-served communities could be better understood monitoring their use of Open Data sets, assuming those data sets are easy to access. Similarly, Temiz and Brown (2017) articulate how third party-driven projects might show how citizens would like to use data and how these datasets can be mashed up and provided in a way that creates more meaning and value for citizens. However, the use of hackathons and Open Data competitions to co-create policy is limited mostly to people with specific competence and thus not necessarily representative of the larger public (Hellberg and Hedstrom, 2015).

Evans and Campos (2013) studied the effects of Open Government initiatives within the Federal Government in the United States. Open Government in the United States is defined by a directive that requires federal agencies to meet the goals of “transparency, participation, and collaboration”. This Open Government directive instructs agencies to “publish government information, improve the quality of government information, create and institutionalize a culture of open government, and create an enabling policy framework for open government”. The authors concluded that “although agencies had significantly invested financial and human resources to the Open Government movement, it remained unclear how these investments increased citizen participation. By focusing efforts on data collection, innovations aimed at enhancing citizen engagement had been delayed. Campos and Evans state that if the “endgame of Open Government is to assist the public in its understanding of the nature and complexity of policies, and with that understanding to inform policy decisions, then Open Government efforts have fallen short.”
3.3 Partnerships and Open Dialogue as an enabling factor for Open Government

Sheedy (2009) describes how narrowing the gap between governments and the public they serve requires providing engagement opportunities that are inclusive. While Sheedy does not specifically focus on Open Government, she provides valuable insight into how government should design public engagement to reinforce democratic processes. The diversity of the Canadian population is an asset and acknowledging the complexity of the diverse needs and challenges of the peoples who make up the citizenry is an essential step in providing inclusive engagement.

The key to better public engagement in Open Government is thus intrinsically related to its accessibility. While technology offers new opportunities to engage with the citizenry, barriers to participation are varied and can range from literacy and language issues to issues of time and sense of self-worth. In Appendix 1, Sheedy (2009) provides a detailed list of barriers to participation and potential solutions in such areas as economic access, citizenship and language, age, ability and gender.

Safarov et al. (2017) demonstrate how Open Government initiatives have more social impact and value where the active participation and feedback of citizens is more readily achievable. Two-way communications are essential to the building of trust between parties involved in participatory decision-making. Most of the trust issues between the public, and, particularly the member of traditionally under-served or excluded communities, can thus be resolved through the building of partnerships and enhanced communications.

However, Bertot et al. (2010) warn that “it is one thing to solicit participation and feedback, and another to actually incorporate such public participation into government regulations, legislation, and services. Comments, feedback and other forms of participations should be:

1) incorporated into the government organization and not lost;
2) vetted; and
3) acted upon in some way – either turned into action that provide the change sought by the public or return feedback as to why action was not taken.
They define Open Government as “bringing technology, people and government to collaborate and participate in the way government works, creates, and promotes and enacts solutions (Bertot et al., 2010)”.

Martín Carcasson describes the dilemma of public engagement as that of the tensions between honouring equality and inclusion, honouring sound data and reasoning, and remaining impartial as a convenor (Carcasson, 2017). This “passionate impartiality” Carcasson describes is based on the fact that there are inherent imbalances of power in any initiative to engage citizens that must be compensated by the convenor: “equality and inclusion make up one key set of democratic commitments deliberative practitioners hold dear we cannot be neutral about whether voices are heard or when the powerful attempt to silence others” (Carcasson, 2017).

Poorly designed public engagement can also lead to further disenfranchisement of under-served communities. If processes are rushed, transactional and adversarial in nature they can further discourage members of the public to participate in participatory decision-making processes. (SFU Centre for Dialogue, 2014). By working in close partnership with community-based organizations government can work to better frame the engagement initiative, ensure the processes are culturally sensitive and feel safe to the members of the communities involved. These partnerships may also help address power imbalances by allowing balanced community representations, participatory decision-making and demonstrating the responsiveness of the government by virtue of its involvement in the partnership (SFU Centre for Dialogue, 2014).

The City of Seattle, which developed a comprehensive strategy for inclusive engagement, suggests maintaining a presence within the community through partnerships with diverse community-based organizations and agencies to enable better community engagement (Inclusive Outreach and Public Engagement Guide, City of Seattle 2009).

Working with community-based organizations to provide training and access may also increase the ability for more marginalized populations to participate in Open Government initiatives. Public libraries offer a unique opportunity to create new civic centres of engagement and hubs for deliberative democracy (Kranich, 2010). They are trusted civic centres in communities and already
provide information, resources and access to computers and forums conducive to public engagement. Public librarians are trained in accessing Open Data and often serve as facilitators for under-served populations needing access to government services and data. The wide diversity of users of public libraries attest to libraries’ relationships and heightened access to communities. By leveraging this important asset present in most Canadian communities, governments can benefit from a safe, neutral and trusted space for public engagement.

“One of the key success factors of public engagement and a common pitfall is the provision of feedback to participants. Reporting back to citizens or members of a given community is an important aspect of transparency and of trust building. Sheedy warns that reporting audiences should include not only funders and decision-makers, but most importantly, participants. Reports should include an overview of the process used as well as outcomes and should clearly indicate how participant input fits and will be used within the overall decision-making process. Sheedy further lists the following success factors when providing feedback to participants:

- Maintain an ongoing dialogue with participants.
- Inform participants of the findings (when appropriate and possible share draft report with participants for their review) and impacts on proposed policy, legislation, regulation and program changes.
- Provide participants with information on next steps.

Transparent feedback to participants is fundamental. Without this, warns Sheedy “power can be maintained in the hands of decision-makers, protecting decision-making processes from the scrutiny of citizens. Citizens should know how their participation helped in making a decision. Reporting to citizens means careful consideration of what they will want to know and should be written in a language that they will understand. If more than one event is planned, communicating with participants between events can keep momentum, help link the events and encourage their
continued involvement.” Sheedy further stresses the importance of giving careful consideration to the ongoing communication with citizens before, during and following any engagement initiative.

### 3.4 Institutionalizing a more mature Open Government model

Open Government implies a commitment to institutionalize public engagement government-wide as opposed to a limited number of departments. “Institutionalizing citizen engagement has both structural and cultural components. First, it requires that citizen engagement becomes a regular, to-be-expected component of the policy development processes. Second, and equally important, the public and policy makers, both of whom are currently somewhat skeptical about citizen engagement, need to be convinced that citizen engagement processes and their results are of value and are a legitimate part of policy development and democracy” (Sheedy, 2009).

#### 4 CRITERIA FOR INSTITUTIONALIZING PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT THROUGHOUT THE GOVERNMENT:

1. Public involvement is a core element embedded in the policy process
2. Public input is given substantial weight in policy development processes; it cannot be a “token” effort, in perception or reality
3. The commitment to institutionalized public involvement is government-wide as opposed to concentrated in certain departments
4. The efforts to institutionalize public involvement include the public service and parliament

*(Turnbull and Aucoin, 2006)*

Woodford argues that given the dynamic nature of policy issues today, including the urgency of some policy problems, it would seem unreasonable to simply assert that participation should occur in every policy case. Criteria should be developed against which policy cases can be objectively assessed to ensure participation is feasible. Given the resources required to carry out a comprehensive and inclusive participation initiative, Woodford suggests that government work in partnership with citizens and participation scholars to develop these criteria. He also advocates promoting transparency and accountability by better communicating with citizens.
Woodford argues that key issues with any ‘what was said’ report are how comprehensive it is, particularly with regard to critiques of government programs and controversial policy issues, and how transparent and specific it is with regard to the decision-making process that occurs post-public involvement. Structural barriers often prevent reports from being fully transparent. Woodford advances that the Auditor General should conduct audits of participatory exercises and releases the results to the public. While much of the Auditor General’s mandate focuses on how the government uses public funds, it also includes the opportunity to ‘comment on policy implementation’ and ‘performance audits’ (Woodford and Preston, 2013).

“The e-Democracia portal was set up in 2009 in Brazil as a pilot project to engage citizens in the legislative process. One of the key factors of its success was the feedback loops between the citizens and the representatives. A final report is compiled which explains what contributions were used and where the representatives responsible for the bill agree or disagree with the contributions put forward and why.”
(Simon et al., 2017)

The five maturity levels defined by Lee et al. (2012) – initial conditions, data transparency, open participation, open collaboration, and ubiquitous engagement – provide another tool for government to assess its progress in implementing Open Government. If adopted by multiple departments, the model can be used as a standardized tool for benchmarking, providing a common language and a framework for planning and implementation. “The model informs government agencies of the focuses, capabilities, processes, outcomes, challenges, best practices, and metrics for each maturity level (Lee et al, 2012).”

4 Conclusions
While more research is needed to explore how Open Government can be more inclusive of communities that are traditionally under-served, we can already conclude that the very design of Open Government principles, data and initiatives must include the user. Not only must the user’s needs be taken into consideration, and barriers to their participation removed, but the user should be consulted and ideally help co-create the principles, tools and initiatives that will allow for an
engagement that goes beyond providing information in an accessible format. An inclusive Open Government is not only about openness in informational terms (vision) but also about openness in interactive terms (voice) (Meijer et al., 2012). The real challenge in the development of Open Government thus lies into truly incorporating the diversity of citizen voices into the apparatus of policy-making, as well as ensuring transparent and accountable methods for feedback. In a world of big data and eroding trust, it also means putting in place the necessary structures to preserve the privacy of citizens’ information.

Another challenge is the changing nature of the concepts of Open Government and Open Data. As the definition of Open Government evolves from focusing on opening up government information, data and processes to focusing on transparency and inclusive public participation and engagement in open dialogue; so must the research. As governments evolve towards the maturity of Open Government, more research is needed on the effectiveness of processes of citizen engagement and participation as well on their capacity to be inclusive and reflective of the diversity of the populations served. Establishing causal links between utilization and potential outcomes of Open Data is also an area where qualitative research is needed, as well as establishing causal links between the type of effect of Open Government and the type of user, as noted by Safarov et al. (2017).

Improving the quality of government information, creating and institutionalizing a culture of Open Government, and the provision of the tools and instruments with which to use the data are all necessary. As is helping users to make sense of data and ensuring public engagement through institutional measures (Jansen et al., 2012). An institutionalized culture of openness and engagement must go beyond simply making data sets available to the public, it should become more collaborative and foster policy co-creation with citizens, regardless of the barriers to participations posed by the nature of the diverse communities forming the citizenry.

Meaningful, thoughtful and inclusive public engagement is the key to bringing Open Government in Canada to its next level of maturity, one where open dialogue and open policy-making may bring the contributions of the diversity of communities across the country to the government apparatus as a whole. Open Government remains a very recent field of investigation for scholars
and while many assume positive societal outcomes from Open Government, the implicit relationships between effects and users still need research and validation.

These themes are important to consider when shaping the experiences of citizens with future Open Government initiatives. While Open Data may provide citizens with access to better information, the effect of their comments or participation is not automatically well-communicated back to them and is not guaranteed to have significant impact on policy. This in turn may lead to further distrust of government and further disenfranchisement for under-served communities. Government that are “open by default,” as per the commitment of the Government of Canada, must therefore consider the role of Open Dialogue.
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### Appendix 1: Barriers to participation and potential solutions (Sheedy, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of exclusion</th>
<th>Barriers to participation</th>
<th>Potential solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross cutting barriers: can be applied to all of the following categories</td>
<td>Sense of worth: People living in poverty or with disabilities, women, sexual minorities, and people of colour or from ethnocultural communities have been stigmatized, belittled and marginalized, for some, much of their lives.</td>
<td>Reinforce in multiple ways that input is valuable. Hire facilitators and staff who are sensitive and skilled at drawing people into the process. Alternatively, sensitize facilitators and staff through adequate training. Hold special pre-sessions for people from these groups to start to voice their opinions in smaller, safer environment. Create “speakers’ lists” to be kept by person sitting beside the facilitator, keeping track of how many men and women, white and non-white people speak. If dominant groups outweigh others, priority should be given to those of non-dominant groups who wish to speak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic: Poverty is by far, the most pervasive and cross cutting issue that excludes people from society</td>
<td>Time: Working three jobs to support a family makes participating in an event almost out of the question.</td>
<td>Consult with the target populations about event times that work for them. Respect end-times. Provide food and childcare. Hold event near work or homes of population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and cultural access: People from different classes inhabit different spaces in society and those with lower socioeconomic status are less likely to have experienced civic participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose a space for the event that is inhabited by the target population(s). Work with trusted community partners (i.e. non-profit organizations). They may be able to arrange a premeeting space so that participants can arrive in a group. Hold event on main public transit line with regular services at times of the event OR provide transportation services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic access: This is perhaps the easiest to overcome from the standpoint of an organizer of citizen engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide remuneration for lost work time, childcare, transportation, etc. Provide food and/or childcare at the event. Provide an honorarium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-cultural and newly arrived Canadians: Many of the barriers mentioned in the economic category also apply to these</td>
<td>Citizenship: by virtue of the phrase “citizen engagement” members of the communities who are not yet full citizens are excluded.</td>
<td>Use alternative words to “citizen engagement” in outreach materials OR clarify what is meant by citizen engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories of exclusion</td>
<td>Barriers to participation</td>
<td>Potential solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups as they are generally more at risk of living in poverty</td>
<td>Language: English and French may not be the first language of ethno-cultural and newly-arrived Canadians</td>
<td>Translate written materials into appropriate languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are many options for event-based translation: whisper translation, group translation on the side; or official translation may be necessary for larger groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social and cultural barriers: people of different cultural backgrounds inhabit their own unique space in communities</td>
<td>Research the social spaces, places of worship, newspapers, and other places of gathering and communication and use them to host events and perform outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Framing: this will have a large impact on who attends, as different groups may value and perceive issues differently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotyping age: Youth are idolized and yet those who are too young or too old are discredited</td>
<td>Legitimacy: youth are stigmatized as being naïve and the elderly as being out of touch with contemporary times. Thus, both groups are often excluded from discussions and decision-making.</td>
<td>Define concepts and frame the problem in ways youth can understand and relate to. Adapt process in ways youth will not be intimidated to speak up (e.g. small group discussions and reporting back in plenary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability: the needs of people living with disabilities are often overlooked, which consequently excludes them.</td>
<td>Physical access: there are a surprising number of public spaces that cannot accommodate a wheelchair.</td>
<td>Ensure that space is accessible and advertise it as such. Set up the event space to accommodate those in wheelchairs (i.e. table height).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation: getting to and from events poses unique challenges to people living with disabilities.</td>
<td>Give sufficient notice of event for people to plan their adapted transport OR provide adapted transport for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication: depending on the person’s disability, they may need assistance communicating with a group of people.</td>
<td>On registration forms, ask people with special needs to specify what they will need to participate, using respectful language. Provide translation in Braille and sign services (determining need before the event).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: while 50% of the population is female, women are still underrepresented in positions of power, and policies do not necessarily reflect their needs. With regards to LGBTQ+ and others, their rights and freedoms are still being negotiated at the state level.</td>
<td>Parenting: while times are slowly changing, women still carry a disproportionate responsibility for childcare and parent care, placing a greater burden on their time</td>
<td>Provide childcare or elder care money to participating parents OR provide childcare (and even elder care) at the event (ask people to register ahead of time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimacy: people who do not fit the dominant model of “male” or “female” are stigmatized and generally face problems of legitimacy in the face of authority.</td>
<td>See potential solutions for “sense of worth” barrier above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>