

IGF Community Public Consultation: Taking stock of the 2018 work programme and 13th IGF and suggestions for 2019 and 14th IGF

Taking Stock of 2018 programming, outputs, preparatory process, community intersessional activities and the 13th annual IGF: What worked well? What worked not so well?

Worked well :

- Registration was easy and quick, well supported by UNESCO
- Useful discussion sessions in the forum
- Multi stakeholder model
- All work is voluntary and highly appreciated as such by all involved.
- Online participation

Tunis Agenda :

- Discussion of public policy issues related to the key elements of Internet governance in order to promote sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet;
- Facilitated speeches between organs that deal with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that are not within the scope of any existing body;
- Interfaces with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on issues under its mandate;
- Facilitated the exchange of information and best practices and, in this sense, make full use of the knowledge of the academic, scientific and technical communities;
- Advised all stakeholders to propose ways and means to accelerate the availability and accessibility of the Internet in the developing world;
- Strengthened and enhanced stakeholder engagement in existing and / or future Internet governance mechanisms, especially in developing countries;
- Identified emerging issues, bring them to the attention of relevant bodies and the general public and, where appropriate, make recommendations;
- Contributed to capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries, taking full advantage of local sources of knowledge and expertise;
- Promoted and continuously evaluated the incorporation of WSIS principles into Internet governance processes;
- Discussion, inter alia, issues related to critical Internet resources;
- Helped find solutions to problems arising from the misuse and use of the Internet, which are of particular concern to day-to-day users;
- Published your procedures

Worked not so well :

- Although there were tangible outcomes, it could have been made more visible to participants during the event and brainstorming the outcomes is very important to continue the positive energy to Berlin.
- lack of time - input/comments is an excuse and participants should always feel more for governance after the event.
- MAG processes - online process is added to the virtual meetings.
- little weight seemed to be given to the call for issues
- Many sessions happening at the same time, many of which were related
- little journalists and news media are included in the overall IGF process
- Online participation in some sessions are not given equal importance.



What suggestions for improvements could be made for 2019? (Please focus on programming, the outputs preparatory processes, community intersessional activities and improvements for the 14th annual meeting and beyond.)

- Focus more on improving online participation and see if we could achieve a dialogue that matches in-person participation. If a governance of internet is to be more meaningful, then there must be more online participation than in-person participation - a barometer to measure how much internet governance has been effective during the Forum dates.
- The larger IGF community and its stakeholder groups have a more significant say in who is chosen for the MAG.
- MAG must be connected to the respective intergovernmental offices related to cybersecurity and respective ministries.
- More is always better - More online preparatory process allowing all participants to share positions and comments online, making it possible to create a consensus on how to proceed early in the IGF cycle, whether in the MAG, BPFs, Working groups, Pilots, etc.
- IGF could work closer with the HLF on Digital cooperation and National security policies.
- Promote more IETF through the IGF reached out successfully to other communities on "Internet mega trends' impact on the Internet's architecture".



How could the IGF respond to the recommendations made by the UN Secretary-General during his speech at the IGF 2018 Opening Ceremony?

- IGF could work closer with the HLF on Digital cooperation and National security and cybersecurity policies.
- More stakeholders (that has experience) that are connected to the UN Secretariat.
- providing active assistance to make innovative proposals work and get accepted. With alignment to MAG scoring system.
- Incentive to participate online and travel fund - the objective is to make online participation as equal as in-person participation. (4th Industrial Revolution, with new technologies aligned directly with the Internet.
- Reducing multidisciplinary /multi stakeholder bias, all those who are affected can participate in IGP
- absence of diversity in the areas of knowledge in the discussions held in the IGF could be linked to the structure of Internet Governance
- Shared language and references approach to the public for promoting more multifaceted dialogue.
- Improve implementing Agenda 71 of Tunis.
- IGF could more actively assume itself as an interface with inter-government entities



How could the IGF respond to President Macron's "call for action" made during his speech at the IGF 2018 Opening Ceremony?

- Real concern about Internet security - need to establish effective regulations that will ensure stability, confidence and security of this system to enhance the worldwide computer network.
- a balance between
 - users' individual rights and public safety, and therefore the importance of multidisciplinary debates on this subject.
 - net neutrality, while very beneficial, also promotes the spread of hate speech and terrorism.
 - globalization and individualization
 - free will and state protection
- IGF - proactively identify emerging issues, where appropriate, make recommendations; find solutions to problems arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, Strengthen and enhance engagement of stakeholders
- MAG could lead more with innovative technological trends / urgent topics and through supporting each other's most urgent topics (especially Intelligence agencies in cyber security).



What other organizations/disciplines should the IGF be collaborating with and how/to what purpose? As mentioned, journalism support and media development networks.

Collaborations could be with and not limited to :

UN system has many programs that are focused in improving collaborations digitally.

Global Blockchain Business Council

Internet Light network architecture - DigI-project

DEF has been implementing the SoochnaSeva (SS) (trans. Information Service) programme since 2014 with support from Qualcomm and the European Union. aided by the MeraApp (trans. My App) .

DEF's Chanderiyaan project with Wireless for Communities (W4C)

IEEE Standards Association (SA), SSIT, SIGHT and TechEthics, FANG (Facebook, Amazon, Netflix and Google) should adopt and respect these standards. The Special Interest Group on Humanitarian Technology (SIGHT), is an IEEE program, established by the IEEE Humanitarian Activities Committee (HAC), The IEEE TechEthics program, HDCA (Human Development and Capabilities Association) , Open Community for Ethics in Autonomous and Intelligent Systems (OCEANIS) - created a cross-disciplinary approach to address social, economic, and legal issues related to digital technologies by bringing these actors together.

UNGGIM, ECOSOC's thematic groups has been a huge success in developing the networks through declarations like Moganshan Declaration (United Nations World Geospatial Information Congress), 2018 and Mexico Declaration at UNGGIM HLPF, 2017.

UNESCO Chair in ICT4D

IGF and best practice forum on gender, the ICANN process, as well as the national mechanism of KICTANet

WHO in 1987 called for a re-orientating of resources in health. this has now hit community level in NZ and is enabling a change of thinking. if this was not done, we would be still in the 'old model'.

SME Competitiveness Outlook



The Secretary-General set up a High-level Panel on Digital Cooperation (HLPDC) to “identify good examples and propose modalities for working cooperatively across sectors, disciplines and borders to address challenges in the digital age”

1. How can the IGF contribute to the work of the HLPDC to help foster these aims? The IGF should be seen as central to the HLPDC process and overall recommendations/actions/plans going forward since it is an official UN event.

WSIS - Paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda confers on the IGF mandated to identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of relevant bodies and the general public and, where appropriate, make recommendations; To help find solutions to problems arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, which are of particular concern to day-to-day users; Strengthen and enhance engagement of stakeholders in existing and / or future Internet governance mechanisms, especially in developing countries; among others.

IGF can contribute to

- Interoperability and coordination on data architecture. A common ground could be created to accommodate everyone values and principles by combining the existing private and/or public activities in the digital space and come out with one global values and principles
- International cooperation and multistakeholder approaches in addressing digital challenges exist, but need to be consolidated and norm-based. Collaboration is widespread in international institutions, companies, governmental bodies, among civil society, and in existing internet governance processes.
- close collaboration with local people by digital feedback, qualitative feedback
- Embedding specific values and principles into routine practices of existing private and/or public activities in digital space could be done through institutionalising a periodical review process or a due diligence procedure.
- Instalment of a verifiable quality management system such as ISO 9001, or other effective periodic review processes by the stakeholders and interested parties, the role and contribution of civil society organisations should not be overlooked.
- 'digital cooperation' charter. Specifically, through the implementation of the above referred principles into laws and cooperation frameworks.

- Trust and voluntary measures through discussion in cybersecurity: 1) ontology/semantics and 2) creating more awareness about the problem of the Internet, underlying technology, vulnerabilities, modus operandi of cyber criminals, geo-strategic realities, power politics, etc.
- strengthening the capacity of existing stakeholders and institutions by better integration with communities, fosters ownership, and leads to the formation of sustainable processes of civic engagement, participation and governance. Ex : self help groups SHG's
- While there are planning and operational tools to practice the DNH approach through new systems, platforms and efforts must be initiated and sustained. UNCT and the UN agencies. Schools and Universities should also be made important institutions around which, the discussions to embed values and principles into activities are taken place. Young entrepreneurs will embed value and principles into activities around their startups.
- It is of paramount importance to ensure planning and design stages take into account values and principles.
- More concretely, we must recognise that in both the private and public sectors, financial value is a primary driver of action. -Citizen education, Compliance agreements, Ethics codes, Citizen and business self-regulation
- These values and principles can be embedded into private and public activities in the digital space through application of the international human rights framework and a multistakeholder framework.
- For states, ensuring that any legislation or policies, as well as other state actions, relating to the internet and other digital technologies is consistent with international human rights law and standards through distributed policymaking model based on the cooperation of key actors and stakeholders.
- Agreed Chart of cooperation between stakeholders especially in Public-private partnerships encompassing
 - Transparency
 - Citizens engagement
 - UN leadership
- The most basic and perhaps only principle that we have succeeded in accepting is that the Internet is a shared responsibility of the 'multi-stakeholder' community which created, uses and maintains it. (World Summit on the Information Society 2003 –2005 and WSIS+10, 2015).

- A better coordination between different public sectors to ensure private actors to get a minimum amount of money which permits economic equilibrium. a PPP would include:
 - i) International donors and local governments
 - ii) Operators funding the continuation of the initial capital investment and excluding capital;
 - iii) Self -entrepreneurs

- By using practical examples (The best practices forums final document of IGF 2018, namely the BPF on Cybersecurity; BPF on Gender & Access; BPF on Internet of Things, Big Data & Artificial Intelligence; BPF on Local Content; CENB IV can contribute as reference documents to the work of the HLPDC)

- By meaningful consultation processes, and full assessment of the impacts of any decisions proposed and taken (not just economic, but also social and environmental) through Multi-stakeholderism and interdisciplinary approach.

- By updating the definition of information that should be a considered a global public good, and willingness to defend and extend the coverage

- actors of the business ecosystem may benefit from fully embracing change by:
 - Valuing and embracing data and technology;
 - Being open to new partnerships;
 - Taking calculated risks; and
 - Creating trust by actively living and implementing these principles, In a decentralised, self-organised manner, local communities convene, advocate, and rally attention in various ways. By improving dedication, the motivation, and the commitment of staff, volunteers, and the many supporters across the world to inspire in moving from principles to cooperation.

- Through a global community of innovators united around a shared vision for a better world in 2030
- By allowing for a shift in the Digital Arena, from management to leadership by defining digital rights or embraced empowered digital citizenship
- By encouraging assessment of a country's digital environment- the notion of "digital constitutionalism"- by UNESCO's ROAM principles: the Internet Universality Indicators framework - includes 303 indicators for 6 categories (Rights, Openness, Accessibility to all, Multi-stakeholder participation, Cross-cutting indicators, and Contextual indicators), 25 themes, and 124 questions. Embed Internet Universality in practice.
- A coherent approach. Due diligence of legislation, business models, treaties, contracts, user agreements w.r.t. the agreed set of common principles (for digital issues) with contact point for evaluating principles.

2. Do you have any specific inputs for the HLPDC in relation to the IGF?

IGF could do more to drive key values that individuals, organizations, and countries should support, protect, foster, or prioritize when working together to address digital issues. Digital issues could be issues in legal instruments, treaties, codes of conduct, partnerships, forums. These digital issues are dependent on the generation - The generations are named as - builders, baby boomers, Generation X, Generation Y, Generation Z and Gen Alpha (Gen Alpha have been born into an era of record birth numbers, and there are around 2.6 million of them nationally. When this generation is complete, in 2024, Generation Alpha births will total almost 5 million over the 15 years from 2010, compared to 4 million births of the Baby Boomers for the 19 years from 1946)

While addressing the digital issues : IGF could coordinate

Individuals, organisations and countries to

- support values of all generations.
- protect values of generations - builders, baby boomers, Generation X, Generation Y, Generation Z
- foster values of generations especially of Generation X, Generation Y, Generation Z, Gen alpha.
- prioritise values of generations - especially of gen alpha, Generation Z while addressing the digital issues.



TLF Tech
Trade Land Finance Tech TM

HLPDC could work together with inputs from IGF and UN STI Forum for 'multistakeholder' digital cooperation which is a cooperative basis for all science, technology and innovative sustainable development in our digital age in creating -

- AI foundations
- Intelligent apps and analytics specifically targeted to women, elders.
- Intelligent things
- Digital twins
- Cloud to the edge
- Conversational platform for stakeholders
- Immersive experience of stakeholder platforms
- Distributed ledger of governance (DLT for governance)