

Inclusive Decision-Making Processes: A Comparative Analysis: Comparative analysis of inclusive decision-making mechanisms in different countries with decentralized governance.

South Asian Community is heterogeneous in terms of culture, social groupings and religion. However, European community is homogeneous in terms of the social groupings and religion. We as South Asian community are quite different from European community. Further, the behavioral, cultural aspect of the social grouping varies. Due to these differences, there is a disparity on how these communities perceive inclusivity and inclusive decision making.

Nepal is the most inclusive government in South Asia. It has ensured inclusivity in all the three tiers of the government. It has assured the representation of woman, people with disabilities, and marginalized groups in three tier of government through reservation. Further, there is reservation of 33% of women in the parliament. Nepal has conceptualized and assured inclusive decision making mechanism by representation in the three tier of government. We reject the American notion that all identities ought to converge to create a single, cohesive American identity. Our 2015 constitution prioritizes maintaining society's diversity over maintaining society's homogeneity. Nepal is a multilingual, multireligious, and multiracial country with many distinct racial groups, languages, faiths, castes, socioeconomic situations, and ethnicities.

However, other countries are regressive. Countries like India have 15% women in Lok Sabha and 13% in Rajya Sabha. The 33% representation of women in parliament is still under consideration in India as of now. The representation of the marginalized communities and people with disabilities is far from the picture in India.

Further, due to the conceptualization of heterogeneity in European communities and American communities they find the concept of reservation a bit unconventional in their context. Their perspective include actively involving civil society and the broader public in policy formulation and regulatory frameworks. Iceland, in particular, has pioneered direct public participation in constitution-making, aiming to integrate the perspectives of various societal segments into governance and decision-making processes, contributing to a more inclusive and participatory democracy. However, such strides have not been seen in other countries.

Further, Nepal in the purview of inclusive decision making mechanism has been successful in actively involving civil society in the public formulation. However, where countries like USA depend upon public voting for the appointment of the head of executive, we still do not rely on public voting. Perhaps, if we adopt systems such as these we can enhance inclusive decision making mechanism.

In navigating this diversity of approaches, Asian countries like Nepal demonstrate adaptability through reservation systems as a means of addressing historical imbalances, while European countries emphasize adaptability through active engagement and representation without rigid reservation systems. The divergence in approaches highlights a perceptual gap regarding inclusivity measures.

To bridge this gap, I propose that an exchange of best practices between continents can facilitate a more nuanced understanding and potentially lead to the development of hybrid approaches. Such hybrid models could integrate effective strategies from both Asian and European paradigms, fostering a global understanding of inclusive decision-making that accommodates regional nuances while promoting universal principles of representation and engagement.