

The Edmonton Citizens' Jury on Internet Voting

Kalina Kamenova and Nicole Goodman

The weekend of November 23 to 25, 2012, seventeen Edmonton citizens took part in a Citizens' Jury, which deliberated on whether to introduce Internet voting as an alternative voting method in future municipal elections. This unique public engagement process was modeled by the University of Alberta's Centre for Public Involvement and is the first of its kind in Canada. The Jury heard testimony from expert witnesses, evaluated the evidence presented and, after extensive deliberation, delivered a verdict in favour of Internet voting. This article summarizes the Jury process, analyzes its outcomes, and discusses lessons learned from this approach to participatory policy development and decision-making.

In recent years, Canadian governments at all levels have looked to public consultation to help bring the voice of citizens into policy decision-making processes. Most notably, the province of British Columbia made history in 2005 by developing and deploying the world's first-ever Citizens' Assembly to help weigh in on electoral reform. Ontario followed in 2007 by convening its own Citizens' Assembly to obtain public insight on the same topic. Although the recommendations of these citizen initiatives were never passed, they helped establish a new tool to foster public participation in policy processes that are typically dominated by elected representatives. Since then, other deliberative public engagement models have been introduced to gain citizen perspective on policy issues or proposed legislative changes. One such event is the Edmonton Citizens' Jury on Internet voting, implemented by the City of Edmonton in collaboration

with the University of Alberta in November 2012, to advise local officials whether to proceed with the introduction of Internet voting as an option in future elections, beginning with a pilot in 2013. Much like the Citizens' Assemblies, albeit smaller, the Edmonton Citizens' Jury sought to tackle a complex policy topic using a novel approach to citizen engagement.

What is a Citizens' Jury?

Citizens' Juries are an innovative, deliberative method of political participation, which promote direct involvement of citizens in policy development, strategic planning, or technology assessment. The major assumption of this approach is that lay people make well-reasoned decisions on complex problems when they participate in focused, deliberative processes.¹ Juries rely on the participatory representativeness of a small group of citizens, rather than statistical representativeness achieved through more traditional consultation approaches such as polling a larger group of people.² They are usually composed of 12-24 members who are randomly selected from the general public. Selection criteria reflect the need to achieve a demographically diverse group—a "mini-public" representative of the larger population. In many cases, additional attitudinal screening is conducted to ensure the jury is reflective of a broad range of societal views.

The most distinctive characteristic of this process is that decisions made by participants are evidence-

Kalina Kamenova is a Post-Doctoral Fellow and Research Director at the University of Alberta's Centre for Public Involvement. She developed the jury concept and was a lead on the Citizens' Jury Research Team. Dr. Kamenova can be reached at kamenova@ualberta.ca. Nicole Goodman is a Post-Doctoral Fellow at the Innovation Policy Lab in the Munk School of Global Affairs at the University of Toronto. Her email address is nicole.goodman@utoronto.ca. The authors thank Professors Marco Adria, Jon Pammett, Edd LeSage, and Ms. Fiona Cavanagh for their participation in the design of the Citizens' Jury process and overall contribution to the research programme.

based and, in many ways, similar to the jury verdict delivered in a court of law. This deliberative process includes the following steps:

- jurors hear evidence from expert witnesses;
- they question the witnesses;
- the information presented is critically reviewed and evaluated;
- the group engages in sustained discussions and deliberation; and
- a “verdict” on the issue or question (“the charge”) under consideration is achieved.

Like a legal jury, the Citizens’ Jury method follows the conventional reasoning that if a small group of citizens, representative of the population, is presented with evidence, their subsequent deliberations and recommendations will reflect the wisdom of the whole community. It is a unique consultative tool that enables the direct representation of citizen views to policy-makers. Juries are particularly effective when there is a commitment on the part of government to affirm the Jury’s verdict, or when this participatory policy model becomes an institutionalized aspect of lawmaking.³

A Citizens’ Jury in Edmonton

In Canada, Citizens’ Juries had previously been deployed for participatory technology assessment as part of a nationwide public consultation in 2001 on regulatory challenges presented by xenotransplantation.⁴ In Alberta, a pilot project was developed in 2008 to evaluate the use of Citizens’ Juries for engaging citizens in priority-setting for health technology assessment.⁵ In both cases, citizens were asked to form an opinion and provide policy advice concerning the introduction of a particular technology, but the process outcomes were not directly linked to decision-making (e.g., the jury’s recommendation was not delivered to a body of elected representatives). By contrast, the verdict and recommendations of the Edmonton Citizens’ Jury on Internet voting were presented directly to City Council, making it the first of its kind in Canada.

The idea to use a Citizens’ Jury came from researchers at the University of Alberta’s Centre for Public Involvement (CPI). The fact that this method provided participants with a systematic, evidence-based education made it an ideal approach to tackle a technical topic like Internet voting. In recent years, the municipal government in Edmonton has worked to increase public involvement and was supportive of a participatory model for decision-making on Internet voting. In 2009, the city collaborated with the University of Alberta to jointly establish the Centre for Public Involvement, an academic centre whose goals

are to promote research and learning related to public involvement and to enhance traditional decision-making processes through public participation. Since its emergence, CPI has partnered with the city to develop joint public involvement initiatives on issues such as municipal budgeting, urban planning, food and agriculture, and energy and climate challenges in Edmonton. The complexity and controversy associated with the subject of Internet voting, however, suggested a more thorough citizen-involvement and learning process may be appropriate. In particular, research conducted by city officials indicated that meaningful engagement of citizens beforehand was necessary to achieve public acceptance and had been instrumental in the success of Internet voting models elsewhere.

The Citizens’ Jury was part of a robust consultation programme carried out concurrently with a pre-trial evaluation of Internet voting by city officials. In addition to the Jury component, the project included a security test that involved a mock “Jellybean election”, which allowed citizens to register and cast an online vote for their favourite colour jelly bean. As part of the public involvement process, CPI also conducted roundtable advisory meetings with stakeholders (e.g. electors with special needs and seniors), and a series of online questionnaires. A total of six surveys were designed to measure a range of public attitudes toward Internet voting. Two of the surveys were administered to the general public, two to Jury participants (one during the selection process and the other afterward), and two were devised to survey citizens who participated in citizens’ roundtables. These roundtables offered additional members of the public, particularly seniors, feedback opportunities to express their thoughts and opinions regarding the possibility of using Internet voting in Edmonton. Taken together, these initiatives were carried out during a four-month consultation process, which took place from September 2012 to December 2012.

Development of the Citizens’ Jury began in the late spring when the Centre’s Research Director recruited academics to partake in a Research Committee, responsible for crafting the attitudinal surveys and designing an inclusive, balanced deliberative process. The committee of six was formed at the end of May 2012 and held eight meetings leading up to the Citizens’ Jury in November 2012. Half of the committee members were affiliated with CPI and the remaining members with other Canadian universities. Members were selected based on their expertise in elections, Internet voting, local politics and decision-making, deliberative democracy, and public participation.

As part of her role on the Research Committee, Nicole Goodman prepared an *Issues Guide*, which provided an overview of key issues and debates associated with Internet voting. This document was based on current scholarly research and the experiences of jurisdictions in Canada and Europe with electronic voting technology. A shortened version of this Guide was distributed to Jury members to help inform their participation in the Citizens' Jury process. A Citizens' Jury Advisory Committee, consisting of nine representatives from academia, government, and other relevant organizations, was also created to provide oversight of decisions as the Jury process unfolded. In addition to these two committees, a Project Team composed of CPI staff and City of Edmonton senior administrators worked together to spearhead the overall Internet voting public consultation programme, including the Citizens' Jury component.

Member Selection

Citizens' Jury member selection was planned in the summer of 2012 and officially took place from October 1 to November 15, 2012. A third party research company, EKOS-Probit, was hired to administer the attitudinal survey of Edmonton's population and conduct the random selection of jury members. The final recruitment and appointment of jurors was carried out by the CPI Project Team in consultation with its advisory and research committees.

The selection process was conducted carefully to ensure participants were a close reflection of the Edmonton public in both demographic and attitudinal respects. Demographic representation focused on characteristics such as age, gender, race and ethnicity, level of education, presence of a disability, household income, number of children in the household, occupation, and residence in Edmonton's twelve wards (see Table 1). Attitudinally, questions probed a range of opinions regarding trust in local government, external and internal efficacy, electoral participation, Internet voting, and confidence in technology (see Table 2). CPI and its advisory committees were careful to choose potential jurors whose attitudes toward Internet voting were representative of the broader Edmonton public, but who also indicated they were open to changing their opinions about online ballots. A survey of 1,349 residents administered by EKOS-Probit from November 6 to 12, 2012 collected demographic and attitudinal profile information of potential jurors. Survey respondents were chosen based on a list of randomly generated landline and cell phone numbers and contacted using an automated calling method.

Potential jurors were then selected based on the data obtained through this process and sent an information

package compiled by CPI, which explained process details, including eligibility and expectations. Citizens' Jury participants were required to be eligible Edmonton electors, able to attend all Jury sessions, and could not be employees of the City of Edmonton. Once a reasonable composition was achieved, jurors were approached by CPI and provided an additional information package and welcome letter. Of the 18 selected, all but one agreed to serve on the Citizens' Jury. Jurors were compensated with an honorarium of \$400 dollars, for their participation in the Jury weekend, which was about 20 hours of work. Meals were provided throughout this time. Travel assistance and childcare were also available for those who required it.

Overall, a variety of groups were represented by the Citizens' Jury. Although target percentages were not always met, a conscientious effort was made to ensure representation was as equitable as possible. Jurors between the ages of 30-49, for example, were more challenging to attract, while the 50+ age group remained slightly over-represented. In all, jurors represented eight of twelve geographic wards and a range of ethnic groups. Persons with disabilities and those belonging to Aboriginal, Inuit, Métis, and First Nation groups were in fact, slightly over-represented.

Attitudinally, jurors exhibited slightly more positive orientations toward the political system, reporting higher levels of trust and faith in their personal ability to have a say. It is likely that citizens who exhibit positive political orientations would be attracted to participate in a public involvement process. Jurors also had somewhat greater confidence in computers, were more likely to believe that the city was ready for the introduction of Internet voting, and that voting must be kept private and secret than the Edmonton public. Reported likelihood of using Internet voting and accessibility to the Internet, however, were exact matches between the general public and the chosen jurors. In as many ways as possible, the Citizens' Jury was a close approximation of the Edmonton public (see Table 1 and Table 2 for demographic and attitudinal breakdown).

The Jury Process

The Citizens' Jury process took place for two and a half days from November 23 to 25, 2012, and was facilitated by two independent moderators. At the outset, jurors were well briefed on the Jury concept, the timelines of the process, and the outcomes required at the end of the Jury. The timeline of the Jury process was designed to enable the jurors' to confidently provide an answer to the question, "*Should the City*

| Demographic trait | | Citizens' Jury | Edmonton population |
|--|--|------------------------|---------------------|
| Age group | 18-29 | 22% (4 Jurors) | 25.35% |
| | 30-49 | 22% (4 Jurors) | 36.82 % |
| | 50+ | 50% (9 Jurors) | 37.83% |
| Sex | Male | 44% (8 Jurors) | 49.85% |
| | Female | 50% (9 Jurors) | 50.15% |
| Education | High School or less | 33% (6 Jurors) | 43.43% |
| | College or apprenticeship | 39% (7 Jurors) | 30.06% |
| | University certificate or degree | 22% (4 Jurors) | 26.51% |
| Ethnicity | South Asian or Chinese | 6% (1 Juror) | 11.57% |
| | Aboriginal, Inuit, Métis or First Nation | 17% (3 Jurors) | 5.28% |
| | Other visible minority | 11% (2 Jurors) | 11.34% |
| | Not a visible minority | 78% (14 Jurors) | 77.09% |
| Disability (activity difficulties/reduction) | | 28% (5 Jurors) | 17.60% |
| Households with children | | 17% (3 Jurors) | 41% |
| Personal income | \$0 - 29,999 | 28% (5 Jurors) | 50.96% |
| | \$29,999 - 59,999 | 39% (7 Jurors) | 30.01% |
| | \$59,999+ | 19% (3 Jurors) | 19.03% |
| Wards 1-12 | | 1 Juror from each ward | 8/12 represented |

| Attitude | Not much (1-3) | Some (4) | A lot (5-7) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| Trust in municipal government | 11% (24%) | 33% (33%) | 50% (41%) |
| External efficacy | 6% (38%) | 39% (32%) | 50% (29%) |
| Internal efficacy | 6% (28%) | 11% (32%) | 78% (38%) |
| Likelihood of using Internet voting | 17% (28%) | 11% (4%) | 67% (67%) |
| Confidence in online ballots | 11% (27%) | 33% (18%) | 50% (55%) |
| Confidence in computers | 11% (25%) | 11% (19%) | 72% (56%) |
| Use tax dollars for Internet voting | 6% (28%) | 33% (37%) | 56% (43%) |
| Edmonton ready for Internet voting | 0% (23%) | 11% (30%) | 83% (46%) |
| Vote must be private and anonymous | 6% (9%) | 6% (12%) | 83% (77%) |
| Access to Internet | 22% (17%) | 17% (26%) | 56% (56%) |
| Fraud prevention methods needed | 6% (4%) | 0% (13%) | 89% (81%) |
| Cost (\$) worthwhile | 6% (10%) | 0% (23%) | 89% (65%) |

of Edmonton adopt Internet voting as an option in future general elections?" Although the question addressed on the potential of offering Internet ballots in future elections, if the proposal were successfully passed by council, a pilot would have been introduced in the October 2013 municipal election.⁷

Throughout the Jury process members were apprised with the *Issues Guide* and heard evidence, supportive and critical of Internet voting, from a series of expert witnesses, including the Chief Electoral Officer of

British Columbia, leading scholars in election studies and e-democracy, computer security experts, business representatives, and municipal administrators from across the country. Witnesses were selected on the advice of the Research Committee and upon review by the Advisory Committee. All experts made presentations, sharing their expertise and informed opinion on a wide range of issues, from the security of Internet voting systems to studies addressing specific jurisdictional experiences with Internet voting

in Canada and Europe. Periods of expert testimony were followed by considerable time for questions and discussion. Follow-up questions with expert witnesses were also permitted on the final day.

Throughout the weekend, the moderators engaged jury participants in many small group activities that allowed them to reflect on the evidence presented, develop their thinking about the topic, and devise any further questions. The group as a whole engaged in extensive deliberation, particularly during the second and third days of the Jury process. The information and complementary exercises enabled the jurors to formulate a well-reasoned, evidence-based verdict and develop recommendations by the end of the process. The final verdict and accompanying recommendations were presented to the City Clerk at the end of the third day.

The Final Verdict

The Citizens' Jury reached a positive conclusion (a "yes" verdict), voting 16 to 1 in favour of adopting Internet voting as an alternative voting method in municipal elections. After further deliberations, however, the decision was achieved by consensus since the juror opposing Internet voting stated he was not entirely antagonistic to the idea and agreed to consent. This juror justified his initial opposition by arguing that the population was not ready to accept this technological change, there were too many knowledge gaps, and, finally, that he did not see any particular advantage of adopting electronic types of voting.

The sixteen jurors who supported the adoption of Internet voting pointed out that they believed Edmontonians were technologically savvy and ready to accept online ballots as a voting option. These jurors perceived Internet voting as a step toward Edmonton becoming a leader in citizen-centered service delivery and e-government. Increased accessibility, especially for people with disabilities, was also cited as a primary rationale for support. The inclusion of online ballots as an additional method of voting was seen as an added convenience for voters who may be busy or absent from Edmonton on election day. Internet voting was perceived to be an extension of existing online services in different spheres of everyday life, and an example of the trend toward automation and growing influence of digital and mobile technology. While jurors supported the introduction of online ballots in Edmonton municipal elections, they did not recommend its adoption for federal elections at this time.

In addition to the supportive verdict, the jurors developed nine recommendations regarding the

implementation of Internet voting in Edmonton's municipal elections. These included:

- Developing a registration system that is simple, quick, and easy for users;
- Adopting an online voting system that has capability to accommodate smart phone and tablet use;
- Conducting further research and evaluation to measure success of Internet voting and improve e-government;
- Using propriety software as a short-term solution, but working to develop an open-source software system for future elections (in collaboration with the University of Alberta);
- Improving accessibility of the voting process for electors (e.g., offering public Internet voting stations that are accessible; offering multiple language options for online registration and online voting, including Braille; adding a telephone line or link that would allow voters to speak with a support agent for assistance);
- Developing a robust communications and education strategy that outlines the security risks of Internet voting and how they are addressed;
- Including telephone voting as an additional voting option alongside Internet voting by 2017;
- Creating measures to improve security and ensure privacy of the vote and;
- Adopting Internet voting in the advanced voting portion of the election only, and for a period of 14 consecutive days prior to election day.

Impact on Decision-Making

Prior to the verdict, city administration announced that they would advise council proceed according to the recommendations made by the Citizens' Jury. This statement was made based on the confidence of senior administrators in the deliberative process and their commitment to follow through with the Jury's decision and recommendations. The administration also committed to provide Jury participants with formal feedback regarding whether their recommendations would be implemented.

City council met on January 23, 2013 to review the Internet voting proposal and make a decision, but resolved to wait to vote on the matter until February 6, 2013 given that a member of the public, a computer programmer from Edmonton, Chris Cates, had requested to speak to council. On January 28, 2013, an Executive Committee of six councillors heard presentations from two members of the Citizens' Jury, who elaborated on the Jury's rationale for supporting Internet voting, and Cates, a public opponent of Internet voting who claimed to have voted twice in the mock Jellybean election. On this basis, Cates' presentation criticized the safety of the Internet voting system, framing online ballots as a threat to democracy.

While the voting portion of the mock election had been tightly controlled and its security had been thoroughly assessed by an independent auditor, the city had not been as vigilant with registration. Privacy and security of the vote had been the primary concern and main goal of the test. Not verifying whether electors had double-registered allowed Cates to register twice.

Taking this new information into consideration, council expressed concern with moving forward. Additional questions surfaced, and although city administration answered them to the best of their ability, there were no experts on hand to weigh in. Although many concerns were addressed through the Citizens' Jury process, city administration had provided councillors with the Jury's verdict and recommendations, but not the entire CPI report prepared about the Jury process. The end result was that some misunderstandings went uncorrected and contributed to negative orientations toward Internet voting among councillors. For example, there was uncertainty regarding whether an Internet voting system would allow candidates to track who had voted in their ridings in the same way that the traditional scrutineer system functions during paper based polls. Internet voting systems do in fact allow candidates to monitor which households have voted (but not who they voted for), but councillors did not have this information.

Registration was also perceived as a concern since there is no voters' list in Edmonton and other Alberta municipalities for municipal and School Board elections. Although security measures could have been implemented to the registration component, councillors were under the impression that conducting this portion of the election electronically would be unsafe. After extensive deliberation by council in the February 6, 2013 session, they voted 11-2 against proceeding with Internet voting in 2013.

Although the 'no decision' by itself is not unfortunate, for Internet voting may not be suitable for every jurisdiction, it is regrettable councillors may have reached their conclusion under the assumption of misinformation. Further qualitative research may provide additional insight as to why council decided not to proceed with an Internet voting pilot given that the public consultation process undertaken by the city had indicated a wide public acceptance of the proposal. In addition to the Jury verdict, public opinion questionnaires administered by CPI and EKOS-Probit, which surveyed the broader Edmonton population as part of the public involvement process, showed strong support from Edmonton residents. Council's decision to vote in opposition to public opinion, without seeking additional expert opinion and advice, and to

reject the Jury recommendations raises concerns about the democratic legitimacy of the process.

Lessons Learned

There are some lessons to be learned from the Edmonton Citizens' Jury. First, this case suggests that the effectiveness of participatory policy models is largely dependent on governments' commitment to follow through with citizens' decisions and recommendations on the issues under consideration. Citizen participation should not be a futile exercise. Rather, when governments actively seek or mandate public involvement, which often requires substantial financial investment and organizational planning, they should be prepared to incorporate citizen input into decision-making. Failing to do so can compromise the legitimacy of the government decision-making.

Second, the Citizens' Jury demonstrates that lay people are capable of acting as competent decision-makers on complex policy issues. The Jury engaged a mini-public, closely representative of Edmonton's population, in a focused deliberation on the proposed policy option of adopting Internet voting in municipal elections. The group engaged in learning about a variety of contextual factors that influence Internet voting programmes in Canada and Europe, and were educated on issues and concerns surrounding the security of electronic voting technology. The process fostered dialogue between citizens and experts from academia, industry, government, and advocacy organizations about the use of Internet voting in Canada at all levels of government. The Jury experience suggests that average citizens can fruitfully contribute to public policy decisions through evidence-based deliberation. Furthermore, the public does not necessarily have to convene for long periods of time like other deliberative bodies such as Citizens' Assemblies. The Edmonton Citizens' Jury on Internet Voting suggests that shorter time frames of learning and deliberation can be effective if executed properly. In addition to time savings, adopting a Jury model can also result in significant cost savings for governments since it requires less resources than larger participatory policy initiatives.

As an experiment in deliberative democracy, the Jury process also tested the ability of citizens to provide a meaningful contribution to technology assessment. It affirmed the value of hybrid forums of technical experts, politicians, and lay people as innovative participatory mechanisms that could extend and enrich traditional political institutions and decision-making processes in representative democracies.⁸ The use of Internet-based technologies in the electoral process continues

to raise uncertainty and remains hotly contested by different societal groups. Participatory methods, such as Citizens' Juries, can allow citizens to engage in learning and provide meaningful input into decision-making on controversial topics.

Fourth, Citizens' Juries can enrich areas of traditional decision-making by administrative officials and elected representatives, that can often be deficient and ineffective. For example, decision-makers may not have sufficient knowledge to make informed decisions or may have limited competences and expertise. Understanding complex policy issues, such as Internet voting, requires a sustained learning effort and dialogue between citizens, experts, and stakeholders, and elected representatives may not have the time and resources to engage in lengthy evaluation processes prior to decision-making. Furthermore, lack of consultation and input from citizens can foster public distrust and weak senses of external efficacy. There is an expectation that direct participation can compensate for such deficiencies. This involves ensuring a process characterized by inclusiveness, equitable representation, accountability and responsiveness to those not included in the consultation process.⁹ It is reasonable to assert that the composition and design of Edmonton Citizens' Jury on Internet voting achieved this.

Fifth, when governments seek to embed public participation in policy-making, greater institutionalization of processes like the Citizens' Jury may be required for Jury models to be effective; although the final outcome of the Edmonton Citizens' Jury on Internet Voting demonstrates how difficult this can be in practice. When this type of process is not institutionalized and legally binding, its effectiveness depends largely on whether administrators and elected representatives are confident in citizens' ability as decision-makers and how willing they are to affirm the Jury's verdict.

In Canada and Europe, where most Internet voting activity has taken place, there has been little to no public consultation. In a majority of cases, citizens are educated and informed about Internet voting processes after governments have established development models. In those jurisdictions where Internet voting is successful, public support is high in spite of little citizen consultation. Case analysis reveals that the inclusion of robust outreach and information programmes result in greater use by citizens and can have a positive impact on voting turnout.¹⁰ Although we are unable to assess the effects of Internet voting in Edmonton, the Citizens' Jury process itself was perceived as an important public engagement initiative, receiving

scholarly attention, positive coverage from media, and supportive comments from residents. It is not clear at this point, however, the effect that council's decision will have on citizen trust in politicians and political processes, and how responsive they perceive local political institutions to be.

A final consideration is the importance of using participatory policy models to gain feedback regarding citizen-centered approaches to service. Internet voting is viewed as part and parcel of a citizen-focused service framework that is geared at putting the citizen first and enhancing accessibility of services for residents. If a policy change is centered on the citizen, it seems only natural to engage a representative group of citizens to develop policy outcomes. The Citizens' Jury model provides a means of involving the public in this sort of policy development.

Conclusion

It is difficult to comment on the overall success of the Edmonton Citizens' Jury since council did not follow through with the advice it imparted. In a sense, this casts a shadow of doubt on the overall effectiveness of the public involvement process. Broadly, however, Citizens' Juries are a novel mechanism in Canada that could be used by government officials at various levels to increase public involvement in policy-making processes that are traditionally dominated by elites. In an age where citizen-centered service and programs are becoming increasingly important for government, it may be worth looking more closely at models such as this, which facilitate representation and public involvement, but are small-scale and do not incur the costs of a referendum or Citizens' Assembly. The fact that city councillors overruled the advice of the Jury and city administration by voting against the Internet voting proposal should not be taken as a failing of the Citizens' Jury process. Rather, it shows that in a representative democracy final decisions on policy proposals rest with elected representatives and they are in a unique position to accept or reject the wisdom of public input.

Notes

- 1 The concept originated in the early 1970s with the development of a method of deliberation called Planning cell or Planungszelle by Professor Peter C. Dienel at the Research Institute for Citizen Participation and Planning Procedures at the University of Wuppertal in Germany. Independently, a similar process was modeled in the mid-1970s under the name of "citizens' committee" by Ned Crosby at the Jefferson Center in Minneapolis, Minnesota. In the late 1980s, Crosby adopted the term "citizens' jury" and registered a trademark on it in the United States.

-
- 2 T. Wakeford, "Citizens Juries: a Radical Alternative for Social Research," *Social Research Update*, Vol. 37, 2002, p. 2.
 - 3 Oregon became the first state to institutionalize a Citizens' Jury style-process to review ballot measures, a Citizens' initiative tool that in recent years has become a divisive and bitter bipartisan issue. On June 1, 2011, the Oregon Legislature voted to permanently implement Oregon Citizen Initiative Review (Oregon CIR). CIR uses Citizens' Juries to deliberate on proposed ballot measures and develop recommendations to Oregon voters, which can help them understand better controversial and partisan issues. For further discussion, see J. Thomson, & S. Burall, "E-petitions aren't enough - Britain should learn from the 'Oregon model' of citizen juries," openDemocracy, October 22, 2011, retrieved from: <http://www.opendemocracy.net/ourkingdom/janice-thomson-simon-burall/e-petitions-arent-enough-britain-should-learn-from-oregon-mod>
 - 4 E.F. Einsiedel, Assessing a controversial medical technology: Canadian public consultations on xenotransplantation. *Public Understanding of Science*, Vol. 11(4), 2002, pp. 315-331.
 - 5 D. Menon, & T. Stafinski, Engaging the public in priority-setting for health technology assessment: Findings from a citizens' jury, *Health Expectations: An International Journal of Public Participation in Health Care and Health Policy*, Vol. 11(3), 2008, pp. 282-293.
 - 6 Attitudinal questions were asked on a 7-point Likert scale. Edmonton population values are in parentheses.
 - 7 If passed, Edmonton would have become the first municipality in Alberta to commit to trial Internet voting in a binding election.
 - 8 M. Callon, P. Lascoumes, & Y. Barthe, *Acting in an Uncertain World: An Essay on Technical Democracy*, Cambridge, 2009, MA: MIT Press.
 - 9 A. Fung, "Varieties of participation in complex governance," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 66, supplement s1, 2006, p. 67.
 - 10 Nicole Goodman. "Internet Voting in a Local Election in Canada" in *Internet and Democracy in Global Perspective*, Eds. Bernard Grofman, Alex Trechsel, and Mark Franklin, Springer Verlag; forthcoming 2013. Jon Pammett and Nicole Goodman. *Key Social Issues in the Planning, Implementation and Use of I-Voting*, Elections Canada, forthcoming 2013.
-