

# CONSTITUTION-MAKING PRIMER

## Public Consultations

Public consultations are undertaken as part of a constitutional process to actively seek input from citizens and organized groups on constitutional content and the constitution-making process. In a participatory process, constitution-making body (CMB) [communications](#) on their activities, [civic education](#) and public consultations are interdependent tasks. These participatory mechanisms have the potential to assist CMBs to develop two-way feedback mechanisms, to give due consideration to informed citizen input and to enable citizens to understand the decisions reflected in the new/revised constitution.

This paper discusses the following topics:

1. Objectives of Public Consultation
2. Practical Tips and Risks to be Mitigated
3. Legal Framework(s) for the Public Consultation Process
4. People to be Consulted
5. When Consultations Should Take Place
6. Forms of Consultations
7. Leading the Consultations
8. Questions to be Asked
9. Documenting of Consultations
10. Incorporation of Consultations back into the Drafting Process
11. Linking Consultations with CMB Communication and Civic Education

### 1. OBJECTIVES OF PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

Constitution-making processes are fundamentally about building buy-in for reforms across multiple levels of political and community stakeholders. In that context, a programme of public consultations can achieve a number of objectives at the same time (see also [Interpeace handbook](#), p. 117):

- To ascertain whether the public supports a constitution making process.
- Solicit inputs from across society on the needs, priorities and content to be reflected in the new/amended constitution. While some submissions will undoubtedly weigh in on issues of constitutional design (should the country have a parliamentary or presidential system?) constitution makers might be particularly interested in questions of people's daily lives; the sort of problems people are confronting, how government is perceived, and what is expected of the government and democratic system more generally.
- Foster a national dialogue and discussion on key political, social and economic issues.
- Expand the agenda of constitution-making beyond what politicians and the elite may want to discuss.

- Enable the CMB to tap a broader group of people to identify innovative options for difficult issues.
- Model a good practice of democratic dialogue, with a view to building trust between citizens and leaders, and creating expectations within society for future democratic engagement by the state.
- Highlight areas of consensus and provide public justification for difficult decisions.
- Promote reconciliation between communities.
- Teach principles and practices of democracy.

See below table describing the modalities, results and uses of public participation in various constitutional processes.

## 2. PRACTICAL TIPS AND RISKS TO BE MITIGATED

Some practical tips for designing a public consultation process include (see [Interpeace handbook](#), p. 120):

- Plan well in advance of the public consultation
- Establish realistic timetables
- Prepare the public to participate meaningfully through civic education and a conducive environment
- Be transparent and representative
- Ensure that the consultative process is accessible, secure and inclusive
- Listen respectfully to the public's views
- Record, collate, analyze and consider faithfully the views submitted
- Carefully consider the public's views when making key decisions
- Be accountable and provide feedback
- Ensure that the consultative process is nationally owned and led
- Evaluate the consultative process

At the same time, consultations may present some challenges and risks (see also [Interpeace handbook](#), p. 119):

- Popular views may not be consistent with rights, freedoms, protection of minority or marginalized groups.
- Citizens and groups may not feel free to speak openly. Laws may be in place that limit speech, expression or association or recent history may mean that society has little confidence or experience with democratic dialogue.
- Divisions within society on particular issues may be brought to the surface. This may exacerbate or even cause polarization.
- Political interest groups may use consultations as platform for political gain or posturing or seek to control, manipulate or even hijack consultations.
- A consultation process will seldom elicit views from “average” citizens. Almost by definition, it is citizens with particular interests who will participate.
- They increase the cost and time needed to complete the constitution-making process.

### 3. LEGAL FRAMEWORK(S) FOR THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS

Public consultations can be implemented at various [phases of the constitution-making process](#). Earlier and more explicit the guarantees for public consultation will increase the opportunity to discuss, plan and implement an appropriate operational plan.

Various documents may be developed to guide the public consultation process, including:

- ❖ **Establishing law, executive order or CMB agreement:** Guarantees for a consultative process could be enshrined in the legal mandate setting out the overall constitution-making process. For example, Colombian Presidential Decree (No. 1926 of 1990), which convened the Constituent Assembly, mandated a nation-wide debate on constitutional change, and created a framework of working groups and preparatory commissions in order to accept and channel submissions from all types of organizations into the Constituent Assembly (see articles 16-17). Guarantees could take the form of defining participation and consultation as principles to guide the work of the CMB(s). The legal foundation could also mandate a particular CMB with conducting a consultative process. Ideally, the legal foundation specifically requires the CMB to give due consideration to any submission or input elicited during consultations. For discussion of examples from Afghanistan (decree) and Kenya (legislation), see [Interpeace handbook](#), p. 114.
- ❖ **Internal regulations:** The [rules of procedure](#) for the CMB could further articulate a commitment to public consultations. The rules may outline criteria for receiving submissions, guidance for conducting public forums, responsibilities of drafters to consider submissions and a requirement to provide information to citizens on decisions that are made. Ideally, rules around public consultation should not be overly rigid, to allow flexibility to adapt the timing and/or modalities of consultations as circumstances change.
- ❖ **Operational plan** – The [CMB work plan](#) should include details about the consultations – when, where, how, with whom, led by whom and how documented? This operational plan will also need to be clear on what funding is needed throughout the process. Ideally, the design of the public consultation plan should itself be consultative, to the extent possible in the context of high pressure and minimal resources. Citizens and groups are more likely to buy into a process that they have been part of designing. More importantly, citizens, civil society and other organized groups can provide useful input on a variety of dimensions, including:
  - Appropriate venues for meetings
  - Mechanisms for submissions and input
  - Appropriate language(s) for meetings or submissions
  - Special logistics for people with special needs (eg, physical disabilities)
  - Groups with expertise, thematic interest, networks or constituencies
  - Groups likely to be marginalized and with whom separate meetings may be required
  - Sensitivities and potential areas or polarization
  - Potential challenges to free speech, expression or association

### 4. PEOPLE TO BE CONSULTED

Public consultations should ideally include as wide a range of actors as possible. It is important to map out the range of stakeholders at the outset, but some general categories should always be considered and special public consultation approaches designed for them:

- The general public
- Civil society organizations – both in the capital and in rural areas

- Youth groups – with specific effort made to reach out to young women and men
- Marginalized groups – including minorities, women and the rural poor
- Traditional leaders and organizations
- Religious leaders and organizations
- Academics and universities
- Private sector interests – including the Chamber of Commerce
- Trade Unions and other collective associations
- Political parties and social movements
- Government agencies and institutions
- Groups with expertise in specific issues

## 5. WHEN CONSULTATIONS SHOULD TAKE PLACE

Consultations may take place at various points throughout the constitution-making process, usually following some form of [civic education](#). There a number of key times during the process when consultation will be particularly important, for example, during:

- ❖ **The design of the process** – In addition to the political negotiations that commonly take place amongst political elites when designing the overall roadmap for the constitution-making process, consultations may also take place with civil society organizations, experts or citizens more broadly at this point. These consultations could be conducted through an existing legislature responsible for passing constitutional legislation, the Government or may be initiated by civil society itself. Ecuador (1997) held a referendum to determine whether there was public support for convening a Constituent Assembly. In addition to this question, the referendum posed non-binding questions on substantive reforms related to the electoral system and the judiciary, among others.
- ❖ **Selection of members of the CMB(s)** – During the process of establishing a new CMB, the authority responsible for selecting and/or endorsing members of the CMB might consult with relevant stakeholder groups. For example, the [Transitional Constitution of South Sudan](#) required the President to consult widely prior to the appointment of the National Constitutional Review Commission. In some cases, in order to legitimize the CMB, citizens may express their preferences directly by electing the members of the CMB, such as the elections for the Nepal National Constituent Assembly and Libya Constitutional Drafting Assembly. In other cases, political parties and civil society groups may nominate individuals, such as with the Sierra Leone Constitutional Review Commission.
- ❖ **Pre-drafting** – Consultations may take place before the CMB begins to negotiate or draft the constitution. These consultations can help to set the agenda, identify key issues and set the framework for subsequent consultations. In some cases, consultations of this nature have even pre-dated civic education, with officials asking citizens experiential questions such as “what are the challenges in your life?” When Constitutional Review Commissions are set up to prepare a draft, consultation at this stage is common practice. In Uganda, for example, the Commission traveled throughout the country and subsequently drafted guidelines to frame their own work and later consultations. In Colombia, the Government established working groups to conduct broad consultations before elections for the constitutional assembly.
- ❖ **Review and drafting of the new text** – Most commonly, public consultations are undertaken in earnest during the process of drafting the new text. These consultations may be general (ie, “what issues would you like to see addressed in the new constitution”) or specific (eg, “How can women’s political participation most effectively be promoted through the constitution?”) A draft of

the constitution may be released for public comment and debate at various stages of the process. For instance, the Tunisian National Constituent Assembly released a number of drafts for public comments and input before finalizing their constitution. Such consultations provide an opportunity for citizens and stakeholder groups to provide specific and structured feedback, and alerts the CMB to likely problems at an early stage. It is important that the draft be made available and distributed to the public with sufficient time to read and understand it. [Civic education](#) on the draft (which should be translated into the local vernacular and could be recorded for illiterate populations) should be considered to achieve maximum reach.

- ❖ **Ratification of text** – Many countries employ a referendum to ratify the constitution text.

## 6. FORMS OF CONSULTATIONS

Public consultations can take place through a variety of forms and forums. The list below provides some general methodologies for undertaking public consultation and receiving public inputs. Ideally though, consultation strategies are shaped with sensitivity to the national social, political and cultural practices and structures in the country, considering questions such as the best form of communication and the social organizations/modalities used by the people of the country.

- ❖ **Public hearings or town hall meetings** – Typically these are public, open meetings where individuals or groups may make presentations or submissions. Hearings may be broadcast on radio, television or covered through the media. See, for example, verbatim transcripts of public hearings in Fiji ([October 2012](#)).
- ❖ **Hearings or meetings with subject-matter experts or advocacy groups** – These meetings may be convened on an invite-only basis or as a public forum with invited speakers. Such hearings are often used to find out the views of key groups in relation to specific topics. For example, in Kenya, constitution-makers held meetings with judges and the legal profession to hear views on whether or not the constitution should establish a new Constitutional Court and a new Supreme Court.
- ❖ **Targeted meetings with minority or marginalized groups** – Special meetings may need to be held with groups who would either not attend or not feel comfortable participating actively in larger, open forums. For example, special meetings may need to be held to address issues of importance to women, minorities, or marginalized groups. One should distinguish between targeted meetings for these groups (which may in some circumstances need to be closed) and meetings on issues of importance to these groups, which may appropriately be open to all citizens. For example, in some cultures, young people and/or women may not speak up when there are (male) elders are also present. In such contexts, it can be important to organize separate meetings to enable these groups to contribute.
- ❖ **Written submissions** – Submissions may be short, one-line sentences or longer memos. CMBs may provide a standard format for submissions, which can be beneficial in allowing members of the public to feel confident that their submissions are in an acceptable format (eg, South Sudan, Zimbabwe, Fiji) or they may be received in whatever form the submitter chooses. Submissions may be sent to a central or local office, handed over during a public hearing or town hall discussion or delivered through local officials or civil society organizations. With increased technology options, CMBs may employ web sites to receive submissions, as in Fiji, Yemen, Kenya, and Georgia, or utilize social media.
- ❖ **Recorded submissions** – The option of recording input on the constitution provides access for illiterate populations but requires staff and time to transcribe. Recordings can be done at public

hearings or one-on-one interviews. With technology advances, citizens might record their views and transmit to the constitution making body through mobile phones or voice-over-internet-protocol. In Fiji and in Kenya from 2008-2009, all public consultation meetings were recorded and were put on the applicable websites.

- ❖ **Stakeholder conferences** - Some CMBs have convened large, multi-day conferences to discuss submissions that have been received, particularly on key issues or an entire draft text. However, these conferences can be expensive, they usually only allow limited time for speakers and they can become a place for grandstanding rather than meaningful exchange of ideas. That said, they can also allow for a larger group to hear diverse views and can operate as a process of consensus building. Zambia held such national conferences at which reports produced regionally were discussed.
- ❖ **Questionnaires or surveys** – The CMB may distribute a written survey or conduct surveys by phone or social media to generate a general framework for their work (see, on this subject, [“Strengthening Constitution Building Processes through Leading-Edge Mobile Technology”](#) and [“Technology Based Public Participation”](#)). Such surveys may also be conducted in partnership with civil society or academic institutions. For example, in Libya, UNDP partnered with the University of Benghazi to run a February 2013 Libya constitutional survey on preferences for the constitutional process. Designing the survey should reflect the particular context (literacy, access to internet and mobile phones and education on constitutional issues).

## 7. LEADING THE CONSULTATIONS

Determining who leads and/or hosts public consultation activities is an important consideration for the credibility of the consultations. Countries have followed different models for convening consultations (see [Interpeace handbook](#), p. 116), with a range of different bodies engaging in such processes, including:

- ❖ **The CMB** – This approach allows members to hear directly the view and concerns of citizens and may provide a closer link to the day-to-day realities. Direct contact may also help to build trust between citizens and the CMB, simply by putting faces to names and listening to each other. The CMB should make every effort to participate in, if not lead, consultations.
- ❖ **An independent but officially-mandated body** – A separate body may be tasked with carrying out civic education and consultations. This may be a good option if the CMB has a limited timeframe or is unlikely to have the political space to implement a participatory process. For example, Ghana had a Civic Education Commission.
- ❖ **Local officials** - Consultations may be delegated to local officials. This approach has the potential to benefit from existing local structures for engaging with the public and to reinforce relationships between citizens and local officials, as well as the CMB and local officials. However, there is a risk that local officials may screen participants or input and may have limited understanding of the constitution-making process. Before the constitutional assembly was elected, the Colombian government established 1,580 working groups of local officials to educate and hold consultations with diverse social, political and cultural groups across the country. The meetings resulted in 100,000 proposals that were ultimately presented to the constitutional assembly. A similar approach was taken in Timor-Leste where 13 district commissions were established to conduct popular consultations prior to the election of the constituent assembly, which had only 150 days to complete its work.

- ❖ **Civil society organizations** – A CMB may work in collaboration with civil society organizations to convene and hold public consultations. CSOs may bring an existing network, relationships from the community and an ability to identify a broad range of participants (including marginalized and minority groups). CSOs may also add credibility to the process, particularly if they develop parallel reports or even observe and report on the consultations in a formal manner. It is important that CSOs are carefully selected to ensure that they have the necessary independence and network to be of benefit to the overall process. It is also important to ensure the CSOs are objective and do not impose their own agenda on the consultation process. In some cases, civil society may initiate consultations outside of the formal process. The output of such consultations may inform a CSO submission to the CMB. Fiji. In Brazil, an umbrella organization of CSOs, PRODASEN, sent 5 million questionnaires to voters and civic groups to solicit suggestions. 72,719 suggestions were received, entered into a computerized databank and subsequently used to inform a submission to the constitutional assembly.

## 8. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED

The following questions might be helpful in planning and planning the consultations:

- What information do CMB members want to know? What groups will provide the necessary information?
- What are the priority issues to be addressed in the constitution?
- What issues were raised during the civic education process if one has taken place? What are lessons learned from such a process?
- What further information and/or technical advice does the CMB need to prepare a coherent constitutional draft?
- Would direct questions be useful? If so, how can questions be framed in a manner that they are relevant to people's daily life or understanding? How can questions be framed so that they are sufficiently neutral and elicit the necessary information without predetermining the answer?

Consultations may be unstructured, semi-structured or structured. Unstructured consultations allow participants to raise any issue or concern. Submissions may be made in any form and each person would determine his or her own structure. The benefit is that it is truly people-driven. The risk is that issue outside the scope of the constitution may be raised.

Semi-structured consultations may proceed according to pre-determined thematic areas for conversation, a set of guiding questions and a facilitator who seeks to engage various opinions or views on a particular topic. This approach allows the consultations to remain more focused, may engage people who would not have otherwise spoken and still leaves room for other issues to come up.

A structured consultation would typically follow a pre-determined set of questions. Participants may be asked to choose between two or more options with little opportunity to propose alternatives. This approach may be particularly helpful when consulting on a draft. A structured submission would have required sections or a specific form to complete.

The type of question may also be informed by the target audience and point in the constitution-making process. It may be helpful to ask broad, general questions to the public, particularly early on in the process when citizens may not fully appreciate the nuances of complex constitutional matters. General questions allow individuals to speak about matters of concern, creating an onus on the constitution-makers to interpret how the comments can be put to use in constitutional drafting. In consultations with experts or official groups, however, it may be preferable to ask specific questions, since the targets are more informed. Later in the process, after significant civic education, public

discourse, and perhaps the dissemination of a constitutional draft, it may be more appropriate to ask the general public specific questions of particular concern.

## 9. DOCUMENTING OF CONSULTATIONS

The credibility of consultations also depends on the way in which submissions or events are documented and used. Effective consultations need a dependable system for [data collection and management](#). The system should:

- Record raw material for future reference and archives (ie, minutes of meetings, recordings and videotapes).
- Store and sort information to allow analysis according to different issues (ie, show all comments related to federalism) and relevant demographic information (ie, gender, age group, region or other relevant categories), which, however, can be difficult to obtain at times.
- Allow citizens to search a database (or submit an information request) to find their input in order increase confidence that their views are being considered; this could include having all submissions made available on the internet, as was the case in Fiji. (In cases where a degree of anonymity might be necessary due to security concerns, submissions can be coded without revealing an individual's identity to the public – as was the case with the Afghanistan Commission.)
- Build in data backup systems to (a) protect against information being lost; and (b) protect the integrity of the data against accusations of manipulation.

In order to build and manage such a system, a team with specific experience in data management as well as an understanding of constitutional issues will be needed. Considerations of anonymity may be necessary in environments where people may not want their identify known.

## 10. INCORPORATION OF CONSULTATIONS BACK INTO THE DRAFTING PROCESS

There is little value in conducting consultations if the information is not passed on to and utilized by drafters. That said, it is not always easy to collate and channel large reams of information and advice in a way that the CMB can utilize.

If members of the CMB participate directly in the consultations, they will bring some memory from the activities that they attended to the drafting process. However, it is also important that the CMB [Secretariat](#) Information Management Team provide an analysis and briefing on public inputs – likely in the form of a written report that organizes, summarizes, and distills the inputs. For the sake of efficiency, a specific thematic committee of the CMB may be tasked with reviewing all submissions and consultation material and making recommendations to the CMB at large. Another approach, utilized for example in South Africa and Yemen, is to provide relevant thematic submissions to the members of the CMB who are dealing with the specific issues addressed in the submissions.

## 11. LINKING CONSULTATIONS WITH CMB COMMUNICATION AND CIVIC EDUCATION

Civic education about the constitutional process can prepare citizens to provide useful feedback in consultations. Citizens need to be informed about the purpose of a constitution, constitutional issues and the constitutional process before they can be expected to participate in a meaningful manner. It is also important to manage their expectations of the process and ensure that they realize that they will not “get their way” on every issue and that the constitution will not solve all of their problems. Effective consultations also depend on effective outreach. Outreach about the opportunities for consultations gives citizens time to prepare, develop consensus in their communities and help to manage expectations. Without investment in civic education and outreach, consultations will at best create a spirit of participation.

Some specific opportunities for civic education and outreach to ensure effective consultations include:

- Before consultations on a draft, the draft must be made available – and possibly in various languages or even recorded formats.
- Advertising with sufficient advance notice when and where consultations will take place.
- Making drafts (and, ideally, summaries and explanatory notes) widely available in various languages and possibly even recorded formats before hearings or consultations.

Finally, communication about the impact of consultations (i.e. how was citizen input used) will help to ensure that people see the process as legitimate, not just window-dressing. Following consultations, the CMB should clearly communicate (1) the extent of consultations (2) broad lines of the “voice of the people” (3) what input resulted in changes – and why and 4) what changes were not made – and why. This information should be documented in a report but also communicated through media and ideally the channels that helped to convene and host the consultation meetings.

Advocates for participatory processes sometimes insist that consultation is needed on every topic and at every phase. Critics of participatory processes argue that the constitution needs to be the result of negotiation among political forces. In reality, the challenge is to design a constitutional process that balances the need to respond to interests of elites with the need to provide channels for the effective representation of citizen concerns – and then to build consensus between them. Perhaps most important is to recognize that there is a range of options for consultation and that those options must be crafted to fit the particular political, society, cultural and conflict dimensions of a particular process.

## Public Participation<sup>1</sup>

<i>Country</i>	<i>Modalities</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Uses</i>
Spain (1978)	No official direct public participation.  However, frequent demonstrations and expressions of public interest as well as robust media coverage.	-	-
Nicaragua (1987)	CSOs invited to testify before commission.  150,000 copies of first draft disseminated around country.  73 town hall meetings heard around country for comments on draft. Town hall meetings broadcast live on radio.	100,000 people attended town halls. 2,500 presentations by citizens 1,800 written submissions.	CA appointed 22 person committee to review public inputs, prepare an advisory report, and write second draft. A number of changes were made based on public inputs.
Brazil (1988)	CA rules allowed civil society, private citizens, and CA members to present suggestions to the thematic subcommittees.  PRODASEN (Government run center for data and information) sent out over 5 million questionnaires to voters and CSOs. Also set up a data bank containing results of 72,719 popular suggestions.  Subcommittees held 182 public hearings.  Some (but not all) sessions of CA broadcast live on radio and TV. CA had a media center that produced 716 TV programs, 700 radio programs, 3000 hours of video and 4,871 interviews with CA members. Five minute segments on CA's work aired twice a day.  CA disseminated a journal on CA's proceedings.	Civil society and citizens presented 11,989 suggestions to the subcommittees even before they began their work.  Citizens could present "popular amendments" to the entire CA with at least 30,000 signatures of voters (after committees had finished work). 120 popular amendments were submitted to the CA. Each amendment also gave the right for a 20 minute presentation to entire CA.	Unclear
Namibia (1990)	Substantial information campaign for CA elections. CA deliberations were open and covered by press.		Unofficial public participation was so wide-ranging and intense that referendum was seen as unnecessary.
Colombia (1991)	Government set up 1580 working groups around the country to receive proposals from citizens and groups.  CA requested proposals from government bodies. Non-government could also submit proposals (but carried less weight).	Over 100,000 proposals for constitutional reforms submitted for review by the working groups.  131 official and 28 other proposals received.	Proposals were studied by commissions/working groups and contributed to draft constitution.

<sup>1</sup> The information in this table is derived from the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) 2010 publication *Framing the State in Times of Transition: Case Studies in Constitution Making*, which is available online at: <http://www.usip.org/publications/framing-the-state-in-times-transition>.

<i>Country</i>	<i>Modalities</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Uses</i>
Cambodia (1993)	<p>Public participation largely from UNTAC human rights efforts and largely consisted of information dissemination and education.</p> <p>Human Rights orgs went to the provinces to conduct workshops and forums on the constitution and human rights.</p> <p>Formal education through schools and informal education through civil society.</p> <p>Also leaflets, brochures, stickers, balloons, comic books, and posters. Radio and TV programs.</p>	Education and training directly reached approx. 120,000 people. Mass communications reached millions.	Unclear
Uganda (1995)	<p>Very popular process – education seminars, debates, media discussions, and submissions from public.</p> <p>Commission members toured country holding seminars and getting input from key groups.</p> <p>Draft constitution was disseminated for comment.</p>	25,547 separate submissions rec'd through: local councils, essay competitions, seminar reports from districts, sub-counties, and other institutions, op-eds, individual submissions, and group submissions, and position papers.	Commission reported that the draft it produced reflected the collected views of the people.
South Africa (1996)	<p>Dissemination and promotion of interim constitution by Dept. of Constitutional Affairs and Planning – ads in variety of media and booklets (early 1994).</p> <p>Thematic Committee 1 (Character of the democratic state) – held 56 meetings and processed 3000 public submissions; also held public hearings. Thematic committees also hosted seminars and workshops where they got expert opinion and CSO on particular issues.</p> <p>Jan. – Nov. 1995 awareness campaign; national advertising campaign – TV, radio, newspapers, and billboards; and national survey to assess effectiveness of public awareness and views on constitutional issues</p> <p>4.5 million copies of first draft distributed in tabloid form around the country., eg, via newspaper inserts., door to door delivery, and taxi kiosks</p> <p>On-going through-out the process: CA newsletter (every 2 weeks, 8 pages, 100K distributed through taxi ranks and 60K to subscribers), TV and radio programs “Constitutional Talk” (allowed CS groups to engage multiparty panel on constitutional issues), telephone talk line, internet web site. Weekly radio show reached over 10 million per week</p>	<p>Survey showed 65% of adults reached by awareness campaign between Jan. - April 1995</p> <p>Close to 2 million submissions received</p> <p>Submissions at public meetings, participatory workshops, and public hearings. Feb – Aug. 1995: 26 public meetings held in all 9 provinces (focused mostly on rural and disadvantaged communities) – more than 200 CA members participated. Over 20K people and 717 CSOs attended public meetings</p> <p>7 million copies of final constitution distributed in all 11 constitutionally recognized languages. March 17-21, 1997 – National Constitution Week. Copies handed out with illustrated guides explaining key features and provisions.</p>	<p>March 20 - fourth const. draft contained a detailed study of the submissions made in response to the publication of the first draft.</p> <p>Technical committees organized all submissions and prepared reports for themed committees, which produced a report for the constitutional committee on the major trends in the submissions and whether consensus on an issue was reached.</p>

<i>Country</i>	<i>Modalities</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Uses</i>
Eritrea (1997)	<p>Commission members and more than 400 specially trained instructors conducted public seminars in village and town meetings on constitutional issues and related political and social questions. Seven provincial offices and seventy-three locally based committees to assist the public education. Pamphlets in Arabic and Tigrinya and translated international instruments.</p> <p>Sept. – Dec. 1995 – Public debates on proposals. Country divided into 4 regions (plus a fifth diaspora region).</p> <p>Draft approved by NA and then disseminated for public comment – published in 3 languages, distributed throughout country and abroad, published in weekly newspapers in 3 languages and broadcast on radio.</p>	500K reached out of the 4.5 million population.	Standing Committee on Civic Education and Public Debates oversaw the documentation and collation of the questions and points raised at the debates. Submitted summary reports to Executive Committee
Venezuela (1999)	CA had a participatory commission; delivered messages on TV; CA sessions were also televised; no effective civic education program	-	-
Albania (1998)	<p>The Administrative Center for the Coordination of Assistance and Public Participation (ACCAPP) collected and distributed information, organized polls and civic education, and provided training to practitioners.</p> <p>ACCAPP first held over a dozen forums and symposia for NGO representatives to discuss constitutional issues.</p> <p>Public hearings were held throughout the country. The hearings were open to everyone and aimed at soliciting comments.</p> <p>ACCAPP provided civic education on the proposed constitution in coordination with local NGOs, the Constitutional Commission and Albanian citizens. The educational programs included issue forums, radio programs, pamphlets, newspaper serials, constitutional papers by experts and essay writing contests.</p>	Results of the forums provided the Commission and its staff an outline of the issues that the public considered to be important.	<p>After hearing public comments, the Commission accepted fifty changes affecting over forty-five articles.</p> <p>ACCAPP indexed and organized all public comments according to subject matter.</p>

<i>Country</i>	<i>Modalities</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Uses</i>
Fiji (1999)	<p>Three months of public and private hearings before report was written.</p> <p>No civic education was conducted by Commission.</p> <p>No public debate on the report. And very little transparency once report was submitted to Parliament.</p> <p>Civic ed. and consultations also conducted by civil society throughout the 1990s and during the CMP.</p> <p>Citizen's Constitutional Forum (CCF) held consultations with a wide range of people and made its own submission to the commission.</p>	632 submissions from groups and organizations (over half from religious groups).	Consultation discussed in commission's report but little evidence of direct impact.
Zimbabwe (2000)	<p>NCA provided civic education throughout country and gathered views. First focused on process. Later turned to substance.</p> <p>Thematic committees formed into 100 provincial teams that held meetings in which they received submissions from public. Each provincial team had nine members (one from each thematic committee).</p> <p>Open meetings – public hearings by the thematic committees at provincial locations; written submissions; and submissions via website. Over 5000 meetings in all 57 districts.</p> <p>Nationwide poll and questionnaire.</p>	Commission rec'd oral and written submissions from individuals and groups, advice from constitutional experts, and academic publications.	Unclear. The legislative framework meant that the process and results were subject to the President's discretion.
East Timor (2002)	<p>UNTAET conducted some civic education.</p> <p>77 commissioners in the 13 districts did civic ed.</p> <p>The thematic committees prepared public hearings and invited representatives of civil-society groups, international organizations, UNTAET, the East Timor Public Administration (ETPA), and the Church to prepare submissions and scheduled their appearances.</p> <p>Debates of CA were broadcast live on radio. There were daily press briefings. Agenda was posted daily.</p> <p>One week of popular consultations after first draft approved.</p> <p>East Timorese Human rights groups also conducted some consultations. They were marginally read by the CA members.</p>		Reports on the inputs were reviewed by political parties and then submitted to the SHC. (Not all inputs were seen by SHC.) Minor changes were made to the draft based on the elite consensus – not the popular inputs.

<i>Country</i>	<i>Modalities</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Uses</i>
Afghanistan (2003)	<p>8 regional offices in Afghan., plus 2 each in Iran and Pakistan (refugee populations); members of the const. commission traveled to provincial capitals and visited refugees, holding meetings with pre-selected community/religious leaders, women, business leaders, academics, professionals; plus questionnaires circulated to the general public through newspapers and an outreach campaign; generally kept discussions to vague/general principles, rather than concrete views on key questions.</p> <p>Commission also conducted info. campaign via TV, radio, print materials; explaining process and Bonn Agreement.</p>	Ultimately tens of thousands of comments were logged by commission staff.	Commission produced a report which described the 80,000 completed questionnaires received, 6,000 written proposals, 523 meetings
Iraq (2005)	<p>No systematic civic education</p> <p>UN Office for Project Services did some surveys on federalism</p> <p>Outreach unit worked in an ad hoc fashion, out of cramped space; issued a one-page questionnaire with 6 questions</p>	By Aug. 15, had rec'd approx. 150,000 submissions but mainly from Baghdad; little from Kurds, Sunnis	No known impact; no written submissions reached the CDC before its dissolution

**Disclaimer:** This document was created as content for constitutionmaker.un.org. It does not necessarily reflect official UN policy or guidance.