

Raw file

Internet Governance Forum Support Association
June 26, 2024
9:00 a.m. ET
Intersessional Event at the IGF 2024 Second Open
Consultations and MAG Meeting

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
719-941-9557
www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> So we are going to now hear from Markus. All your questions, right, Markus, will be answered. Over to Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Carol. Yes, I am Markus Kummer. (Inaudible).

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Now it's on. Okay. Let's try again. I am Markus Kummer. I am the cofacilitator of the Dynamic Coalition Coordination Group. As I said before we broke for lunch, the idea to have this event came from the Dynamic Coalition Coordination Group, and it's took into account many comments that are made that we should have a better integration of the Intersessional of the various components of the Intersessional work into the main stream of the IGF.

So the idea this time around is not just present the work, but also see how the various components of the Intersessional work, that is Dynamic Coalitions, Best Practice Forums, Policy Networks, could contribute to the main themes chosen by the MAG and could be part of the sessions -- of the main sessions at the MAG and could

be part of the preparatory process.

But we have prepared some presentations under each of the four main themes, including NRIs, including Dynamic Coalitions, Best Practice Forums, Policy Networks, and Dynamic Coalitions. But before we go into the substance, I would like to ask Celine -- as you know, she is here to support the Dynamic Coalitions, and she does that very efficiently, and she has prepared an overall presentation on all the Intersessional work. Over to you, Celine.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you very much, Markus. I am not going to take too much of the time because we really wanted to actually give the floor to representatives of the Intersessional work in general. But we were thinking of really providing you from the Secretariat a kind of overview of all the IGF Intersessional work that we are actually having. We are very often referring to Intersessional work, and we are really thinking of providing you some very concrete examples of what it actually means, what they are doing, and then later on I will give the floor to various representatives under each of the four IGF 2024 subthemes.

Good. So we conducted, actually, a very, very short survey to get to know a little bit more about the overall work of Dynamic Coalitions, policy networks, Best Practice Forums, and also NRIs. We received a lot of responses from Dynamic Coalitions. Lately we've had actually 32 of these Dynamic Coalitions. And all of them are still active. Active means that they are providing an annual report and that they conduct activities throughout the year.

So from these 32 Dynamic Coalitions, 20 replied to the survey. We are still continuing on gathering the information. But from these 20, we have over 1500 members, actually. What does it mean? It means that we have a network that is really spread throughout the world, throughout each stakeholder group. And here you can see that the representation starts actually with civil society being really the strongest representation in Dynamic Coalitions. This inclusion also academia. Then followed by the technical community. And then we do have, in most of the Dynamic Coalitions, also governments and private sector representatives.

Then moving forward to the policy networks and best practice forums, these are two streams that you know very well because the MAG is also participating in these and also making the proposals. We ask the consultants kindly to provide more information on them. And currently in the four workstreams of these policy networks and best practice forums, we do have over 180 members. Of course, some are active in several, but it means that you have 180 members being active in these four groups.

Representation is follows: Civil society, technical community, and then governments & representatives also active in these policy networks and best practice forums.

Good. And when it comes to the NRIs, of course, we have 170 of them, so that's a larger exercise to do to collect data through our survey. But the membership, as you can imagine, varies because we do have national ones, we do have subregional ones and regional

ones, so the size and the scope in general varies a lot.

Representation of all stakeholder groups is really well represented, of course, in all the NRIs. Just by the nature of the IGF.

Now Phulely we wanted to provide some spotlights, just a few of the various NRIs and Dynamic Coalitions that we are actually having. EuroDIG, as you know, some of you already attended EuroDIG this year. Took place from the 17th through the 19th of June in Vilnius. Shortly after, we had the Central Asian IGF. This was a very successful event with over 250 participants on-site. We really had a good backup from the Uzbek Ministry with an ICT minister also providing some opening remarks. This is actually a really good example of how an NRI, a very active NRI, is also engaging at a different level, namely the central Asian subregional IGF. So that presentation will be shared. You are going to have access to the various links. And I really encourage you to actually explore also some other NRIs that we are having.

And then also something that I quickly wanted to share is the upcoming West African IGF that is going to take place in Dakar this year with the topic of disruptive technologies. This is also a very nice example of the Intersessional work working together. We do now have some parliamentary tracks, some DCs implicated. We do have, of course, some other participants outside of West Africa also attending. This is a nice example of what the IGF and the community is actually doing.

Good. Now coming to the Dynamic Coalitions. This is a point I will mention later. I think it will really be beneficial for you to also explore all the various Intersessional work that we are having and also the list of Dynamic Coalitions. We do have at least six new Dynamic Coalitions within the past year. One of them is, for example, measuring digital inclusion, which is actually led by UNESCO and has also a network of several hundreds of various stakeholders. That might be beneficial when curating the programme for the IGF 2024 because you can really tap into the network of experts that they do have.

Next is also a very interesting new Dynamic Coalition that we have, and it is on the interplanetary Internet. This is backed by a lot of governments because we do have representatives from NASA, from ESA and the Japanese space agency, together with academia and also the technical community. So this is another very interesting Dynamic Coalition that is worth exploring also on our website. They do have very nice introductory presentation.

And now moving on to one of the other spotlights that we wanted to mention is, for example, the Dynamic Coalition on Sustainability of Journalism and News Media. We are going to share a little bit more information later on. Unfortunately, these representatives were unable to join the call, so this is the reason why we wanted to highlight these. But it comes, actually, before I give the floor to other representatives, a nice opportunity to really explore the IGF Intersessional work, especially now while you

are curating the IGF 2024 programme.

So the reports of current and past Policy Networks and best practice Forums are available on our website. You can connect with national, subregional, regional, and also youth IGF initiatives.

And last but not least, please visit the pages of the IGF Dynamic Coalitions. And you would always find coordinators on each of the Dynamic Coalitions that you can reach out to in case you are interested in the theme, in case you would like to connect with experts, speakers, or whatsoever. So this is something else that Markus will also reiterate later on is that the IGF Intersessional work really stands ready to support with the preparation of the IGF 2024. So I leave it to that, and thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Celine, for this comprehensive introduction into the wealth of all the Intersessional work that is going on between the sessions, the annual sessions.

Now, let us turn to the first theme, Improving digital governance for the Internet we want. We have two representatives of NRIs, one Dynamic Coalition, and the Policy Network to speak on these issues. The first one is representative of the France IGF. Lucia, please, you have the floor. Isn't Lucia on the call? Then I pass it on to Tijani from North Africa.

>> TIJANI: Thank you very much for inviting me. Improving digital governance for the Internet We Want. It is -- do you hear me? Do you hear me? Do you hear me? Hello, do you hear me?

>> Yes, we do.

>> Yes, we can.

>> TIJANI: The Internet we want is an Internet that will make us enabled to have all services on the same network. It is a secure Internet with the whole network secured using the best and up-to-date technical tools, such as the NSEC. To give a stable Internet with no traffic perturbation with things such as bots, malware, phishing, spyware, et cetera. And finally, it is an Internet without surveillance from any power, whether they be governments, national or foreign, or any other party. And without illegitimate use of the Internet data -- of the users' data, excuse me.

We work on all the four points, but we especially focus on the last one, (?) Internet. That is most key about data governance, and that is today the most important concern of all Internet users, especially with the artificial intelligence solutions, which credibility depends mainly on the availability and the quality of the data.

Today we hear people speaking about data protection, data security, data governance, data sovereignty, et cetera. There is a big fear and almost no trust on the system used, especially with the experience of various surveillance programmes. Please don't think that those mentioned are only people who are surveilling us. All others who have the power to access our data from any country are doing the same. The difference is that they are not known.

In my opinion, we should all analyze best practice forums, policy networks, Dynamic Coalitions. We should all work diligently

for a fair data governance, respecting privacy and preventing malicious abuse of users' data.

Through the establishment of binding international laws or treaties that prevent governments and companies to first illegitimately collect users' data and then use them for political, financial, or other kind of interests. And define an agreed-on (?) for the global public interest only. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Tijani, for this contribution. Is Lucian on the call? It doesn't seem to be the case. Can we go to the Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values. Olivier, are you on the call?

>> Yes, I am.

>> Please go ahead.

>> I am the chair of the Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values. We have, I think, presented to the MAG in the past. But our work effectively centres on the values on which the Internet was developed. So we are looking at things like the Internet being global. It's a global medium open to all, regardless of geography, nationality. It's interoperable, as it's a network of networks. So the interoperability of each computer system with other computer systems has to happen. As a network of networks, it's open. It's decentralized. Until, I would say, a few years ago, it was purely end-to-end, so application-specific features resided at the edge of the Internet in the end-user's hands, and it was, as a result, completely user centric. Also, the whole point of the Internet was it is robust and reliable. We have seen it in so many years.

We started our work in 2009 to define these values, and you might have seen other work that was performed by other organisations calling these the Internet invariants as well. And then it also transformed, in some way, with others working into the Internet we want. What constitutes the Internet we want tomorrow? What constitutes the Internet we have today? These are the core Internet values. And then what we want tomorrow. So we've contributed to quite some extent to the Internet and the work recently in the Internet we want and the sessions we've had, et cetera.

We have also looked at how these values might change over time. A few years ago, we also introduced the concept of safety. Because in the early days of the Internet, when it was all devised originally, pretty much everyone knew everyone else. But as the Internet grew, it certainly brought some people that nobody knew. And therefore, the evolution of the Internet with this concept of freedom from harm was something that we've added to the core Internet values. I think we agreed on that a number of years ago. And we are now looking at a couple of things in parallel.

First, we've worked for quite some time with the Dynamic Coalition on IoT, Internet of things, because in Internet of Things, there is Internet. They have worked extremely well for a number of good practice scenarios. And this year they have been focusing on IoT and sustainability. Now we are also coming into this question as to, well, should sustainability of the Internet be also a core

Internet value? Should we look at that?

We have actually worked on a -- well, recently, at the EuroDIG, I intervened in the DC-IoT session as a sort of joint work with them. And we are going to follow on with that to find out if we should have some more Internet values around sustainability.

The other interest at the moment is about AI. And so the question has been formulated in the group, with all of this flurry, these new things going on about artificial intelligence, what is the governance that there is around AI these days? And could the governance of artificial intelligence learn from the governments in the digital space of the Internet that we've had so far? Are there core AI values? And that's what we are thinking about. And for this, in fact, we will be working on something that will emerge onto a session, hopefully, of the forthcoming IGF with people from the Policy Network on AI as well also joining us in order to join force. So you can see there's some collaboration, cross-collaboration, between Intersessional groups and Intersessional work that goes across the different groups together.

I think that's enough. That's what we've been up to. And the work goes on.

And whoever is after me is mute or I can't hear anyone.

>> It's actually the room that is muted. Perhaps you can speak into that microphone.

>> Okay. Can you hear me? Thank you, Olivier. Yes, Dynamic Coalition of core Internet values have been going, as far as I remember, for more than 15 years now and produced valuable work.

Now the next speaker will be on Policy Network on Internet Fragmentation. That is Bruno. Would you please intervene.

>> Thanks. Hi everyone again. Just very briefly on the Policy Network on Internet Fragmentation, just wanted to mention that we kicked off the work for the year. Last week we hosted a webinar with around 45, 40 people, where we kind of laid out what would be the goals for the work this year, what will be the priority points, and how do we move forward the framework for the PNIF.

(Audio stopped)

On the WSIS+20/review to input and governance process, there was support for -- yeah. Two tracks, one on WSIS and governance practice, and the second one that would be an inventory of fragmentation examples.

On WSIS + 20, we agreed with moving forward with a possible input to the review as part of an effort to support an unfragmented and relevant approach to governance process and also a word of support for the multistakeholder model. And on what we are calling an inventory, it would be really a discussion on Internet fragmentation, providing positive examples of an open Internet and examples of negative actions that could result in fragmentation of the space.

The work last year already highlights some of those examples, but we really just want to showcase them a little bit further. And I do believe they are going to contribute to both the

discussions exclusively on this track are you but also to the IGF Programme track this year. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much. We will go now to -- don't worry. We will have plenty of time for discussion right at the end of the presentation. Right now we have a presenter who has only a small window, so we go straight to the next group. That's Enhancing the Digital Contribution to Peace, Development and Sustainability. There we have a Dynamic Coalition on the Sustainability of Journalism and News Media. And there's Waqas Naeem, and you have the floor now. Please, Waqas.

>> Thank you very much. I hope you can hear me.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: We can hear you.

>> WAQAS: Thank you. I think some of my comments will also overlap with some of the other IGF subthemes, and especially in connection with the comments that Olivia just made regarding AI. So the Dynamic Coalition on journalism and news media mostly works of how it can help with the business viability of public media. We are interested in how digital policies are being formed that can supply new and alternative revenue models for public interest media around the world. So apart from our regular work, we also work on a thematic report each year. And this report usually compiles the contributions and empirical evidence from our members.

This year's thematic group work is focused on AI and journalism. Again, it will not be a surprise for many because of the advances and developments that we have seen regarding AI over the past year and a half. We've noticed that there's a lot of interest regarding this topic in our subsectors of the news media and media development, which form an important segment of our DC's member. Specifically we are interested in looking at the development of AI policies, AI governance, and its use from a media development perspective, from a perspective of how it might affect journalism. So we are in the process of developing this annual report. It will be ready by the end of the year, by December, before the IGF event. But we've already had a round of call for proposals for our membership internally. And we have selected some very interesting abstracts and case study ideas. So I will briefly touch upon that. The findings or outcomes that we expect from this report will include a findings from a large-scale perception survey of journalists on how they are using AI tools and technologies around the world and what the challenges and issues to see from it. We will also have some case studies from news media organisations that are based in the MENA and Africa region, who have tried to, again, use AI tools in their news rooms and have experiences to share. And finally, in the findings and outcomes that we hope to share through this report, we'll also have some focus on Asia, where there have been many elections this year. In which we've noticed the use of AI content and its effects on local media freedoms and the freedom of expression.

So in this way, I feel our thematic report this year can contribute to this particular sub-theme in terms of exploring how

the development of digital policies, especially AI policies, can also contribute to media development and vice versa. But also in connection with the next sub-theme, especially looking at, you know, the inclusion of fundamental freedoms, especially freedom of expression principles, again, in the development of ethical policies around AI governance and its use.

We also do a lot of work on basically exploring alternative revenue models for media through digital policies and through digital governance. On this, our membership has been very active in the past few years focusing on looking at the use of news bargaining codes and other digital policies. And last year we also started facilitating engagement between our members and national regulators in different countries. These are media regulators, but they are also increasingly given the responsibility of regulating cyberspace or content regulation in their respective countries. We felt there was an important intersection there to think about public interest media and freedom of expression principles.

So I will stop here, but thank you so much for this opportunity. And I hope that we can also touch base with other Dynamic Coalitions that are also working on AI so that we can perhaps find opportunities to collaborate and linkages where we can bring our diverse perspectives to the same issue and topic. Thank you so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you so much for this contribution. And one comment you made is obviously applies to all the Dynamic Coalitions, very difficult to put you just under one theme. So many of them could contribute to more than just one theme.

Now we have also another Dynamic Coalition that will be contributing to two particular themes. It is the Internet Standard Security and Safety Coalition, by its acronym, IS3C. We have without de Natris. Are you there?

>> WOUT: Yes, sorry I could not be there in person at least, but I am here online.

I think that the Dynamic Coalition on Internet standard security and safety Coalition, or IS3C, has one main goal, and that is making Internet more safe by rapid deployment of existing security Internet standards and ICT best practices.

In the past two years, we presented reports comparing and rating national Internet of Things policies at the global level, pointing to the huge gap between the demand made on knowledge and tertiary cybersecurity curricula and the knowledge and skills in those educational institutions. In which we worked closely with youth diggers of the year 2022. We showed how far governments and industry use the economic buying power to procure their ICT secure by design. And we presented a tool how they can do so by presenting the most urgent Internet standards to them.

Finally, we have collaborated to publish UN reports on data governance.

But why is the topic of Internet standards deployment so important? The Internet is the basis our world runs on nowadays.

We work, buy, rest, and play, and to slightly paraphrase an ad for a candy bar some of you may remember, but what is the Internet, and what makes it work? And I am going to paraphrase Olivier's presentation as well. Many organisations and governments point to the necessity to protect the public core of the Internet. But what is that core? You may think it's cables and routers and submarine cables and servers and server locations and whatnot. And you are right. But it is also a set of software. Software that runs behind the system that nobody notices it is really there. But it would be impossible to connect without the Internet protocol. Without the Domain Name System. Without a routing protocol. Without an email protocol, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. These are the Internet standards that this Coalition is discusses. Without them, the Internet does not function. Without them, we cannot do anything on the Internet.

These standards have one thing in common. They were all created well before the masses came online, without the necessity of security. And although we have to marvel at the robustness of these standards, they need to be updated or patched if we talk about a Microsoft update, we patch our laptops, our computers.

The technical community has provided these updates in the past decades in the form of new standards. But numbers, however, show that the patching by industry is quite slow. It's here that the subthemes of the Internet of the IGF come into view. We hear attacks of loss of data, of cyber espionage, of ransomware, et cetera, et cetera, on a daily basis. It is not only a threat to innovation, but also to peace and development. And why is this? Many of the attacks are enabled by the flaws in the old pre-1994 Internet standards. A risk that can be avoided easily by patching the old with the new.

So let me give just one example. Why have most banks not deployed the new DNS standard called DNS Security Extensions? And why do banks not put pressure on ISPs to deploy anti-spoofing measures? Both will make the life of phishers and phishing expeditions a lot harder, and at the same time, customers would be protected a lot more from these phishing attacks. But it does not happen.

Talking about the balance of risks, this risk has to become more balanced by moving away from the end user responsibility to a shared responsibility of, A, sensible use by the end user, and B, provide secure-by-design ICTs. Whether they be services, whether they be devices, whether they are software, website, applications, et cetera. This is what IS3C's experts work at to promote widespread deployment of standards and best practices and make sure the balance of the risk -- the risks are balanced between the two.

I will come back to peace a little later in this meeting. Thank you for the opportunity, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Wout. Now we go to the next theme. That is harnessing education and balancing risks in the digital space. The first speaker will be Amrita Choudhury, who speaks for

the Policy Network on artificial intelligence. Please, you have the floor.

>> AMRITA: Thank you very much, Markus. And I will be presenting on the policy network on AI. We are fairly young. We are just two years old. We started after the etope Yan IGF.

So the Policy Network on AI is an open platform that anyone can come and participate and contribute. The focus is primarily on AI and related aspects of data governance with a lens for the developing country and especially not Latine languages. And it is to bring the multistakeholder community together for discussions and to create synergies and inputs which can feed into the global AI policy dialogue.

So in the first year of its -- of starting it, worked on three tracks, which was global interoperability of AI governance; AI and gender race; environment and AI. And the reports of 2023 could actually be looked at at the website. And this year, we are actually focusing on four subgroups. One is on environmental sustainability and the AI value chain. The second is AI governance, interoperability, and good practices. The third is on labour issues within AI's lifecycle. And the fourth is on liability as a mechanism for ensuring AI accountability.

There are -- as I mentioned, there are four subgroups which are working on it. Currently, what the subgroups are doing is gathering more information and best practices within the community. And then the idea, we have a timeframe which we could share later because we have limited time to present here. And then we would be calling on experts and having open discussions to seek comments from the community. However, the monthly calls of PNEI is open to all. What we would like to see is more of the Dynamic Coalitions, the NRIs, come in and share their views or even the inputs. For example, the working documents of the subgroups could also be shared for those who are interested. And you can share the best practices which you have come across or anything which you feel is important to comment on.

While this is a bit more than what the topic is which Markus shared, but we would encourage everyone, including the MAG members and others, to look at it and comment on it. Incidentally, we actually made a submission to the high level advisory body on AI, and they also plan to make similar submissions to other discussions.

I will end it here, Markus. If there are any questions, happy to take them.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Amrita. Your plea was well heard that you ask for more collaboration among the various components of the Intersessional work. And that's precisely the purpose of this very session.

And I have to apologize, we left out one speaker for the previous item, but these items are very closely related, so on enhancing the digital contribution to peace, development, and sustainability, we also have the BPF on cybersecurity. And we have Karina and Octavia here in the room. I think Karina will present,

but Octavia will be also ready for questions for the Q&A afterwards. Please, Karina. Again, my apologies.

>> Karina: Okay. Thank you. Karina, MAG member, for the record. Hello, everyone. Thank you for giving me the floor.

As we presented during the first open consultation, we have established four working groups. But after several meetings with Joseph and Melissa, me, and others, Adriana, former MAG member, Dina, MAG member, and our consultant, during the recent kickoff meeting, we outlined two strategic areas for this year.

The number one is analyze the overlap of cybersecurity initiatives. As well as to map or catalog these initiatives. We aim to exploring the possible role of the BPF. As a comment, we would like to add that the BPF security capacity building can be considered a new BPF because between 2018 and 2023, the BPF cybersecurity focused on the development, value, and application of cybersecurity norms and agreement. A completely different topic.

And number two, strengthening the possibility to understand the risk, threat, and opportunity in cybersecurity arising from the new technology, such as artificial intelligence and quantum computing.

We cordially extended the invitation to participate in the cybersecurity BPF. We have shared the subscription means in the meeting chat. Thank you. And we appreciate an opportunity to present our work, and thank you, Mark.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Karina. Now we go back to the other sub-theme, harnessing innovation and balancing risks in the digital space. And we have once again Wout, who speaks on behalf of the IS3C. And as you already had the opportunity to present your Dynamic Coalition, I call on you to be concise, short, and snappy. Please, Wout, you have the floor.

>> WOUT: Yes, thank you, Markus. I can leave out a lot, as you say.

But to give a very short recap, my previous intervention, I pointed to the public core of the Internet and the standards that are the software part of that core and the need to balance the risk between end use and ICT industry.

Now to the point of how the deployment of Internet standards can contribute to peace and development.

To start with the latter, our research into skills and cybersecurity training has revealed that there is not only a skills gap, both in hard and soft skills, but also a gender gap and of not enough youths that are interested in a career in cybersecurity. So slowly but surely also an age gap.

So the outcomes, perhaps surprisingly, are more or less identical across the globe. Despite having different challenges at the beginning of its education, the outcomes are identical. Our team led by Janice Richardson has suggested to form a sort of task force, which we call the Hub under the IGF. At this point, this proves a bit bridge too far. But where else can we bring these different stakeholders together and create a neutral ground for them to work

together at an equal level? That could be the IGF. This is food for thought. If the IGF wants to make itself more relevant in the coming years.

So our plan is there. But the funding, however, is not. As I already mentioned, the public core of the Internet is abused and attacked every day. This not only endangers development, but also peace. Cyberspace is used for all sort of gray area attacks. You will know examples of these yourself. By closing many of these attack factors, that is the flaws in the Domain Name System, in the routing, in the email protocols I also mentioned, but also by demanding better-developed software, deploying IoT security standards in connected devices by securing websites, et cetera, et cetera, prevents not only loss of data, which may hamper innovation, but also spying in on meetings and a lot more.

This is not a silver bullet. Don't get me wrong. What it is is an inversed shot of hail. The shot of hail the attackers usually use in the hope one of the little bullets sticks and the hole and the flaw is found. This closes these holes.

Buying secure by design is the best option forward. Who needs to be convinced to deploy or procure secure by design? These are the decision-takers in organisations. They need to be convinced of the necessity to deploy Internet standards or to buy secure ICTs by design.

Looking at deployment numbers, the current arguments they are using are not overly successful. So here is our tool and our product for this year, the next tool will be an alternative set of arguments technicians can use to convince their bosses to actually deploy these standards or to buy with these standards on board.

A more secure and safer Internet should be the Internet we want. And here I point to Tijani who said the same. So our work here as well, a more secure and safer Internet will sustain peace and development. We had hoped to do more in 2024, turning our recommendations into actions, into training curricula for educators, for procurement officers, et cetera. However, it proves too hard to find the funding to hire our experts, to pay for the support and the coordination. Our common future depends on the development of a more secure and safer Internet for all its users. To cyber educate our youth, people willing to change career to become our digital soldiers, that is what people working in cybersecurity are, and the world has to start realizing this.

To achieve our goals, IS3C needs active help in several ways. Not just financial. We need to cooperate more. If we receive this, the output will make IGF the place people come to for guidance, for coordination, and for strong policy recommendations. All organisations in the world can work with to secure themselves, their environment, and their country. So we should start working together to get the Internet that we want. Thank you, Markus.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And with that, we come to the last theme defined by the MAG, that is advancing human rights and inclusion in the digital age.

And the first speaker will be a representative of the Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability, known as DCAD. And we have to say DCAD is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, Dynamic Coalition, and they have been very active throughout the life span of the IGF and the guidelines on accessibility, the IGF Secretariat uses to make the meetings accessible are actually have been developed by the DCAD. And it is a living document that is regularly being updated.

And the speaker we have is participating remotely, and he has also been a regular at our meetings. Mohammed Shabbir, please, you have the floor. Over to you, Mohammed.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thank you very much, Markus. Talking about the human rights, advancing human rights in the digital age, humans are the core factor in this theme. And talking about people with disability, the work of the mandate of the Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability is quite advanced, and I am thankful to Markus for our beautiful introduction of our Dynamic Coalition.

Ladies and gentlemen, according to states, about 15% of world's population comprises of people with disabilities. How many of them are contributing in these discussions as the representative of people with disabilities? We, Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability, have about 150 members. And our membership is not restricted to people with disabilities. So you would have a good idea of how people with disabilities, how less people with disabilities are contributing in these discussions.

And keeping in view the number of and the huge number of them in the world, we need not to say and emphasize the role of their contributions in these discussions. The Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability, since its inception, has been doing a lot to make these meetings accessible. But sometimes it seems one step forward, two steps backwards. I won't go into those kind of discussions here, but I can certainly expand on this statement. I say this very responsibly and expand on it if there is a question on there.

The Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability has been doing a lot of work in terms of bringing the voice of people with disabilities into different IGF discussions at national, regional, and global level. Since 2022, we have also started a fellowship programme, courtesy of Vint CERF and Google LLC, to provide opportunities to people with disabilities to participate in IGF discussions, IGF global discussions. But due to lack of funding and staff, we are unable to do so with every NRI and other initiatives.

But thanks to the interest of the initiatives with like-minded people, we have been able to ensure that two of the largest initiatives in Internet Governance in the Asia Pacific region, particularly the Asia Pacific Regional Internet Governance Forum, and the Asia-Pacific School on Internet Governance, they for the last two years or so, in their fellowship programmes, keep a special seat for people with lived experience of disabilities.

At the same time, this year we contributed a session into

the EuroDIG. We also give our input from the perspective of persons with disabilities and accessibility and disability in the Global Digital Compact discussions, draft zero and after. We are also updating the lived guidelines that Markus mentioned in his kind remarks in the introduction. With the consciousness of that those guidelines are the basis for making these meetings accessible. So I really urge you to go through those guidelines, consult those guidelines when you prepare and plan for meetings, be they online or in remote or in person mode.

We have also been, for the last year, we have also been running a unique fellowship, the APSIG and AP IGF Fellowship, they have special seats for people with disabilities. But Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability runs a fellowship that is for people with lived experience of disability. Last year, we ran first of its series. This year we are planning closely with the Secretariat along with the registration and participation of IGF. So this programme funds the participation of persons with disabilities. And the uniqueness of this is that we provide the accessibility arrangements and facilities remaining within our limited budgets to people with lived experience of disability to participate, to enable them to participate in IGF in the way they want and provide them the accessible facilities that they require. We do not put any limitations onto the ask. We remain within our budgets, but we try to fulfill the needs of the person. Because if we are able to take one person to IGF and meet his or her needs, we would feel that we fulfilled our purpose.

Last year we were able to bring six people with lived experience of disabilities to the IGF. This year we are planning. Let's see how much are we able to bring to the table.

I stop here if there are any questions to come. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, Muhammad. We count on you and your colleagues of DCAD to assist also our gracious hosts this year for the IGF in Riyadh. And we may come back to you when we have the open discussions.

The next speaker will be Eleni, you have the floor.

>> Hello. Thank you, thank you, Markus. Thank you for giving me the opportunity. I represent the Secretariat of the OER Dynamic Coalition that started in 2020, just after COVID. So we facilitate advocacy, knowledge sharing, and capacity building to leverage the potential of open content that is openly licensed educational content in digital learning, to promote universal access to information.

And this has become particularly important after the COVID-19 crisis because it caused a paradigm shift in access to education for learners of all ages. And OER has played a crucial role and demonstrated its power in contributing to continuity of formal and informal learning.

OER is part of an ecosystem reflecting the collective contributions and efforts to universal access to information. And what we call in UNESCO the creation of inclusive knowledge societies. And this Dynamic Coalition brings together stakeholders from Member

States, Ministries responsible for education, IT professionals, national commissions, educational institutions and bodies, specialized institutions, civil society, and the private sector.

This year we published an important capacity development initiative to guide Member States on implementing the recommendation that is policy and capacity-building guidelines featuring best practices in each action area of the OER recommendation. And these guidelines are in English, but we are currently translating them in Arabic and French. And we are currently focusing on preparing the third UNESCO World OER Congress that is themed "Digital Public Good: Open Solutions for Inclusive Access to Knowledge" that will take place in Dubai in November 2024. And leading up to the Congress, we have a series of regional consultations that will take place. And we aim to gather insights and feedback from stakeholders in drafting an Outcome Document towards decision-makers in education and communication technology sectors that will provide an analysis of the impact of emerging technologies on the recommendation and the OER landscape in general.

And we would like to have an Outcome Document that will offer solutions and best practices for leveraging OER with emerging technologies that is AI and blockchain effectively.

And with the support of the IGF community, we hope we could amplify our impact and achieve even more significant outcomes. Thank you. Thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you very much, Eleni. And now the last speaker on our list, last but not least, is on behalf of the Policy Network on Meaningful Access. Allagy, please, you have the floor.

>> Thank you very much. Good afternoon. The Policy NRC on Meaningful Access has been going on for the past two years, and it is anchored on three fundamental principles, the first one being connectivity, which is about infrastructure. The next one is about digital inclusion through citizen approach. And the third one is about capacity development in ICT.

We can all remember that almost half of the world is still not connected to the Internet. And when you talk about those that are even connected, we still have some issues dealing with inclusiveness, usefulness, sustainability, and also affordability.

Now, as far as the network's concerned, we have priority goals. First is to bring the achievements and solutions into the future. That is on digital compact initiative and effectively contribute to the roadmap leading to the Summit of the Future 2024, WSIS + 20. Then also to work upon the key issues and deliberations. Collated by the community in 2023, bringing them to the attention of the IGF Secretariat, which we have started doing. And also to amplify the voices of the groups that are less heard in the public debate on meaningful access and encourage their involvement in the network.

We also want to pay special attention to the use of the AI applications by these groups traditionally marginalized.

Now, the opt-out put of 2023 we have previously said, and

the recommendations also is to take a look at the issues that were highlighted in the output and then see how best we can fix the gaps in 2024. And also to set up a permanent call for the network representative collating new experiences and statuses and identifying good practices. We actually see learning from experiences across the world. We also want to expand activities crucial in our work of the policy network regional and global actors to promote regional initiatives and encourage project replication and scaling.

Now, priority focus and collaboration now is to guide and assist the IGF Secretariat on the panel and also to work within systems such as the EU and also in Government organisations like ICANN, ITU, WIPO, et cetera. And also new and relevant stakeholders where we can all work together to promote this inclusiveness and also to have meaningful access to the Internet. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. And with that, we close the list of speakers. We have had speakers to all of the four themes for this year's IGF. Now, as I said in my introductory remark, the purpose of this session was twofold. On the one hand, provide information on the breadth of activities of all the Intersessional activities. And on the other hand, also to provide input into the creation of the programme for this year's IGF under these four themes.

We have some time for discussion. First I wonder whether there are any questions to the speakers. Not all of the speakers are still online. Some of them had other meetings. But we see there are already requests for the floor, and there is Abdullateef. Yes, please, you have the floor. Abdullateef, you have the floor.

>> Abdullateef: Hello. Good day, everyone, please. Thank you all for your wonderful presentation. My question goes to issue of artificial intelligence guide. Honestly, AI in Nigeria, we have been having challenges that has to do with the use of AI. And the challenge we have had, it is not just the challenge but -- (audio stopped)

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Abdullateef? You can write your questions. Maybe it's easier that way.

>> ABDULLATEEF: I am sorry, please. All right. So my question goes to the first presenter, which is Ms. Katrina. This is on AI. How can AI improve critical decision-making, and (audio breaking up). And the second question is on data security. What measures should be implemented to protect data used in AI applications. The reason I am asking this question is because we -- on behalf of my organisation, we have been working seriously on the children faced with a lot of challenges that has to do with lack of parent, due to emergencies, flooding, what have you. So how we can give them a better life.

We have set up so many things that has to do with training them, retraining them, returning them back to school. But the little challenge we have in that regard is little funding. We have limited resources to continue. And the community we faced, we have Ghana,

we have Somalia, we have Afghanistan, and those are the places we have targeted and we have been working on tirelessly. We have our land, we have acquired land there to develop -- it's yet to be developed.

So my question is on this, how to set up the digital training for these children so we can bring them back to the normal fold, so they can fit into the global world? So thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Are there other questions in the room or online?

Comments?

Suggestions on how to integrate all these valuable contributions into the main programme?

Lito has a hand up. Please, Lito.

>> Thank you. I am a MAG member. On the first open consultation this year, we, as part of the working group processes, received the suggestion to include into the proposal form the relationship between the proponent and the Intersessional work. We included it, and we had a multiple choice stating DNF, DC, whatever, NRI. But -- and we clarified that it wasn't needed that for the evaluation purposes.

So my question or follow-up is have you thought about what to do with that data? I mean, maybe it reinforces the proposals, especially the ones that are going to be selected for the IGF. With specific DC or policy network or whatever Intersessional work.

And I was reading some answers, some of them are blank because they have no relationship, which is okay. But some of them, they say we have relationship with DC and NRI or whatever. But we didn't ask which Dynamic Coalition or NRI specifically they had relationship. So I was wondering if that information is enough? Do we need to improve for next year the question? And maybe think about what to do with that information, which was not mandatory, but may be useful to strengthen the work of the Intersessional work with the workshop proposal that we have received. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Yes, I think all very valuable comments. I think one point came rather late in the process, the idea. And as you said, it was not mandatory. And that is always a little bit the case, if it's not mandatory, then people may or may not pay any much attention to it. But I think Celine can answer the question more in detail. And would you have a comment on the same issue? And Chris is already online too. Celine first, then Chris.

>> Thank you very much. Yes, indeed, this was a first time that we included an additional question in the workshop proposal form asking whether the organizer is somehow involved in an IGF Intersessional work. And we didn't specify the question more than that. So this is, of course, something that the MAG can consider also in the future. But just for you to know that 41% of those who submitted workshop proposals are affiliated in some kind of way with either a Dynamic Coalition, Policy Network, or an NRI. So this is a pretty high number, actually, and also very welcomed. Because for us it was actually a good sign that most of the organizers are also

somehow involved throughout the year, not just at the annual meeting, and also contributing to policy networks, reports that are then going to be presented at the annual IGF. So that's all for now. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Chris?

>> Yeah, thank you, Markus. And thanks, Celine, for that explanation.

I mean, I really kind of wanted to plus one a little what Lito was saying. Because I do think, you know, now that we have 32 DCs operational? Which I think is a very good thing, and it's -- obviously, there's a lot of diversity there, and there's a lot of effort going in. But it does mean we probably need to be a little bit more selective and a bit more creative in how those DCs make their way into the annual programme because we simply don't have unlimited real estate.

I think it's important to understand, even as though 32 are active in the past 12 months, that doesn't mean they are all sort of operating at full capacity. There will be some that will see this as a banner year where they are producing certain outputs, and that's something that would be really difficult to highlight. There are others who may be continuing the conversation but looking to have a major report published in the next year or the year after.

So I think the more -- I think it would be useful for us to look at maybe some more coordination activities, and this, today's session, is a very good step towards that. But maybe even a quarterly sort of meeting or call of some kind so that the MAG has good understanding before this point in the process even of, okay, what are the DCs that are producing outputs this year that we really want to make sure get highlighted, get included in the programme, and we can sort of push them, that are relevant to current other processes that are going on that we maybe want to make sure that the output from this particular DC gets into this other process that's going on. Whether it's the AI advisory body that's producing its report or the GDC process that's ongoing. Just two examples there that spring to mind. So yeah, I think that would be something really useful. And Lito I think has a very practical point there that this can also be integrated into that workshop proposal form. So thanks. Thank you for that. And that was very much also behind the intention behind creating this session here to give an update. And one thought was also that DCs should, for instance, report on the state of their work and see whether anything was in the pipeline. It's clear that not every year you can produce a major output. So that's obviously taken. And the DC's also realize that they cannot just bank on automatically getting a session. So there was also one thought that maybe it may be more value if they can be part of a session instead of having their own main session. Let's say should you have a major report, it may have more impact if that's presented in a main session rather than in a separate session on the DC. All these are valuable. You would like to follow up? Yes, please.

>> Sorry. Just a two-finger follow-up. I would be curious to

get your thoughts, Markus. Do you see a need for more coordination with the DCs and the other Intersessional activities? Or are they sort of coordinating and aligning as effectively as they need to?

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, this is also one -- it goes both ways. DCs, we have always encouraged the DCs. We look at what's going on and go subscribe to the various lists and be active also in another. And the same goes, obviously, to the various other components. Look at the DCs. If the NRIs need expertise for one of the DCs for one of your sessions and so on.

You mentioned artificial intelligence as actually providing input in another governmental on this High-Level Panel on AI. Also the BPF on cybersecurity has also provided input on the open-ended working group. These things do happen, but there's clearly room for more coordination, more mutual information also on what's happening. And also to see how collectively we can improve. I mean, just get out of the silo and be more, maybe, horizontal and cross-sectoral in your work. But we have more voices who would like to take the floor. I think one of them is my co-facilitator, Jutta, who is participating remotely. And Wout, but you have spoken quite a bit, so you come last. Jutta, you first.

>> JUTTA CROLL: Thank you very much for giving me the floor. I think it's really interesting to understand the relationship between the Intersessional work. If we have 40% already related, we also have 59% who haven't at least mentioned their affiliation to part of the Intersessional work. And I do think it's very useful to deploy these data, those who have not yet a relationship. And especially there are workshop proposals that might not be accepted into the programme because we have limited space. Then on the other hand, these could be brought into contact with other strands of Intersessional work, and probably the input they have to give with the workshop proposals might be very beneficial for the various aspects of Intersessional work. So I really do think it was a really good exercise to put that into the form. And I have heard that from the community of children's rights that people find that beneficial. And if we can go that step further to deploy this data to make the network a bit stronger, then I think that is really good. Thank you.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. That's also a very constructive suggestion. And Celine would have some comments on that.

>> CELINE BAL: Thank you. Just to add some comments regarding what Chris mentioned and also his question.

So within this -- so the question in the workshop form sometimes also indicated several Intersessional workstreams. So this also shows in the first place that, you know, they are not only active in a Dynamic Coalition or primarily active in a Dynamic Coalition. So sometimes you have one that is active in all three streams, so NRIs, PNs, and BPFs.

And also one thing that we have also tried to do this year with Dynamic Coalitions is we know that the number of Dynamic Coalitions is growing. And we cannot allocate individual Dynamic

Coalition sessions to each of the groups. So we really tried to have a collaborative approach where Dynamic Coalitions work actually together to submit some joint proposals. Of course, this is the first year that we tried to implement that approach. But this is something that we thought that, you know, might also be a very nice approach to be a little bit more collaborative amongst Dynamic Coalitions. So that is just from my side. Thank you so much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And Anriette.

>> (Off microphone). That is the extent to which the DCs are not just reporting into the IGF but into other spaces. And you mentioned the example of the open-ended working group. I can also speak for the DC on Community Connectivity, with the Internet Society and APC and the ITU have actually managed to get licenses for community radios at national level as a result of that work. And I think the DNS Research Foundation report, the evaluation they did of the IGF, actually highlights how Dynamic Coalitions are very impactful.

But I also wanted to ask the Intersessional -- you don't maybe have the time. But do any of the Intersessional activities that are participating today, do you work with the IGF messages? Is there anything in that output that you actually do? Do you discuss it? Do you check whether your work is reflected in that? Do you use that to set your agenda for the coming year? I am just wondering if we are getting to -- if that work cycle of taking the outputs of one IGF and feeding it into the Intersessional work, which is something we aspire to, whether that's actually taking place or not.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Excellent question. Question noted. And I can't answer this question. But I don't know whether anyone would like to comment. But it's also something we could follow up and maybe have a survey or after the next IGF invite all the components of Intersessional work to look at the messages and how to take these forward.

Are there other comments? Is Wout still on the waiting list? Wout, please.

>> WOUT: Thank you, Markus. I realize I am speaking for the third time, but it's on a different topic.

First, coming back to the 41% and 59% very shortly. What I would have hoped is where proposals indicate, yes, we have some link to DC, but that is perhaps not clear or to other Intersessional work, that we would be pointed to each other somehow. So that we could make each other stronger. That workshop proposals would get to know about DCs better and integration would be better of the work, and output of DCs would be stronger. So I hope to get the message of some sort saying, hey, these guys are organizing a session. You should be contacting them. So that's what I would have hoped for. That's one.

Now, the different topic is -- and I have -- I keep hearing this noise, but it's -- I think I am still on.

In the past, I have asked MAG how output of DCs can receive a formal kind of recognition. In the past two years, we have seen

that the DCs have received far more attention than in the past, and it's clear that several of them are striving to produce strong outputs. This is a step forward as an example of the strength of the IGF in the documents that the IGF is producing and what they can contribute to the outcomes of the IGF.

For DCs, it would be a justified question to answer, what is exactly the difference with the policy network for some of them?

Today I can only speak for my own DC. So how can output receive some form of recognition from the IGF? ICG adheres to a strong internal governance structure. I am putting that in the Chat for you now so that you can see what our internal rules are. We work with the internal governance structure, including public consultation of our draft outcomes, working with volunteer experts who assist in drafting the reports. You find the link to it in the Chat, as already said, but one click away are all our reports as well. We do not object to working with the MAG and thus give up some of our independence. Coming back to Anriette's session, we are even willing to accept guidance if topics come up. If something comes up and we have not thought of it ourselves, then come and step us to us and say would you help us with some sort of recommendation? So we would be willing to accept it provided that we find the funding to pay the people who have to do the work.

It's not up to ISEG to suggest or decide on this suggestion. But if we have a suggestion to the output, and the MAG designates a member to oversee the process. Who then advises the MAG on output. But that would not be unlike the work on the overseeing of BPFs. So if we want to strengthen the IGF -- and this is a message that is strongly conveyed recently -- the strength of having DCs must be utilized further and more. So I kindly ask the MAG to consider to take this next step and start a discussion with the DCs that are interested to follow this sort of procedure. And then we will strengthen the IGF. So I am willing to work with the MAG on this and other DCs, just do a survey and see which of them are. And then we know and we know what we are talking about.

So thank you for this opportunity.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you for that. Coming really to the end, but I see a raised hand by Muhammed Shabbir, and I would not close the session without giving him the opportunity to provide his comments. Please, Muhammad.

>> Muhammad Shabbir: Thank you. I echo what Wout has said about Dynamic Coalition and accessibility and its coordinator.

DCAD has been trying since long to make and give its input onto making the digital infrastructure as well as the physical IGF accessible for people with disabilities. But more often than not, what happens is after the inception of any programme, the inputs of the DCAD is taken. So it would be really helpful if the DCAD is consulted on the matters of accessibility for persons with disabilities since the project or any action is started. Because it's easier to bring accessible, to build accessible from the start than to retrofit accessibility in any of the projects, as well as

it's more costly. Thank you very much.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: The guidelines are de facto guidelines, but they have never been formally approved as it happens. But Chris has a moment as well.

>> Yeah, thank you, Markus. It was just a question reacting a little to Wout's comments there. He mentioned, you know, a survey of some kind to see what other DCs would be interested in that kind of arrangement where, you know, some loss of autonomy comes with some more formal recognition. Has the DCCSG -- sorry DCG -- done that survey already? I think that would be the best format in which to do such a survey, and it would be an interesting data point to have as to if this is actually a widely sought evolution.

>> MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. Well, we have had this discussion repeatedly. But I mean, the basic difference between the DCs and the other -- and the PNs and the BPFs, they are -- the Secretariat is holding the pen, and they are driven by the MAG. Whereas the DCs are autonomous and bottom-up. So basically, pro quo. So basically, if you want to keep your autonomy and do your own bit, or do you want to be part of -- and that's what I think Wout alluded to. That's the discussion we would need to have. What does it need to be, then, recognized as an IGF output? I think it could well be done. We could have a trial basis or ask, does a DC think they have an output worthwhile being considered as an IGF output? Would the MAG be comfortable with that? Would there be tweaking needed of the output? That's the sort of discussion. I think one discussion we could have, again, is with the DCAD. They provided the guidelines that are de facto used as the IGF guidelines. Now, do you want to give them the label as an IGF output? I tried when I was chairing the MAG to make that palatable to the MAG, but the answer was no. It's beginning of a slippery slope. You know, but these were different times. These were more than ten years ago. So maybe now the MAG may be thinking differently on that. But obviously, we cannot just give a blank check and say whatever comes out of a DC is automatically recognized as IGF output. There would need to be some process in place. But definitely that is something for further discussion.

Also, discussion was quite interesting on -- Bolito started it on the form, the connection with other components. That definitely can be refined. And I think the -- I am sure the -- we might say that's mandatory. That's my personal take on that. But obviously, there is the opportunity for follow-up on that. Can we bring them together with DC, and all this means, obviously, more work for the Secretariat. We should not forget. It's with limited resources. There's only so much you can do. But I think we already are a little bit over our allotted time, so coming to my conclusion. And I think it was not the end of a discussion, but the beginning of a discussion. It seems to me the feedback we had on this discussion, there's appetite for continuing in one way or another. Not maybe just once a year, but maybe more on a continuous basis to have the feedback between. I think it's useful for everybody

involved to know a little bit more what's happening under the big roof of the IGF. With that, I hand back to you, Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I had a quick conversation with Chris on this during the break, and maybe we can look at maybe chairing some of the MAG meetings, putting one aside for this type of opportunity, so people know exactly what's going on.

I think sometimes one of the drawbacks we have is how to measure the productivity of not only the DCs, the NRIs, the MAG itself -- and this is something else we discussed, coming up with some kind of format where -- or measurement so we can try to highlight who is doing what and how well or how well.

I think one of the things we also discussed in one of the coordinating meetings with DCs as well as the NRIs is to review the mandatory review, the guidelines that we have for them. So hopefully we will also get back to that. But thank you very much, everybody who presented. We look forward to hearing from you again. Thank you.

(End of session, 10:35 a.m. ET)

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.