A draft framework for capacity development for the Internet Governance Forum, 29 February 2020

Prepared by Anriette Esterhuysen as part of a 2019 IGF Secretariat research consultancy

Table of contents

Acknowledgements

About this document

The task of developing a framework for capacity building for the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) was part of a consultancy contract implemented in late 2019. The final version was completed at the end of February 2020. The task involved conducting an assessment of the capacity building needs of IGF stakeholders particularly in least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small islands developing states (LDC/LLDC/SIDS) and developing countries as well as the needs of young people. It also involved an assessment of capacity building provided by National, Regional and Youth Initiatives (NRIs), Dynamic Coalitions and regional Internet governanceschools to determine what their capacity building needs are, and how they can work with the IGF Secretariat to meet those needs. The needs assessment is documented in a separate report as is the overview of current capacity building activities. This document explores how the IGF Secretariat, MAG and wider IGF community can "help increase the capacity of people from underrepresented and marginalized communities, engage and interact in the IGF process". It proposes a draft IGF capacity development framework, and an approach to operationalising this framework. The assessment of IGF stakeholders' capacity development needs which forms the basis of this framework is available as a separate document and serves as an important point of reference for understanding how this framework was developed. It also contains a list of topics for IGF-based capacity development that were identified by respondents.

1. Capacity development[1] and the IGF mandate

Developing capacity is in the mandate of the IGF as outlined in the Tunis Agenda (the outcome document of the second phase of the World Summit on the Information Society – WSIS) which asks the Forum to "contribute to capacity-building for Internet governance in developing countries, drawing fully on local sources of knowledge and expertise."[2] In 2012 the Commission on Science and Technology for Development's (CSTD) Working Group on Improvements to the IGF[3] affirmed this and recommended that the IGF's role as a "one-stop shop" for people to increase their knowledge and understanding of Internet governance issues be strengthened. They proposed the introduction of **a structured "one stop shop" track of capacity development oriented events** at the annual Forum, organised in a cooperative manner with the participation of "all bodies dealing with Internet governance".[4] They also proposed ensuring that newcomers receive adequate orientation and support, and, possibly as a vehicle for the "one-stop shop", encouraged the establishment of an Internet Governance Observatory to provide updated information on issues, trends and opportunities.[5]

Four years later, recommendations from the 2016 IGF retreat process[6] built on these proposals. The existing direct and indirect capacity development role of the IGF was examined and the idea of an IGF capacity-building track endorsed with the added suggestion to dedicate day zero[7] to capacity

---

1 For the purpose of this document "capacity development" is the preferred term and is also used by UNDESA because it implies that capacity exists already and can be developed further, as opposed to starting from a base of zero capacity. However as "capacity-building" was used by many of the respondents to the call for input this term will also be used from time to time.

2 Tunis Agenda paragraph 92.

3 Report of the Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum, 16 March 2012. A/67/65–E/2012/48. https://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/a67d65_en.pdf

4 Ibid. Paragraphs 47 and 48

5 Ibid Paragraph 49.

6 Recommendations are at https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3367/711 and all the proposals submitted as inputs into the IGF Retreat process can be accessed at https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/igf-retreat-documents.

development. Also included, reflecting how the IGF had evolved by then, were proposals to link the capacity-building track to NRIs and other intersessional activities.

Both the Working Group on IGF improvement and the IGF retreat identified capacity development as an area of activity for a strengthened IGF[7] and mentioned people and institutions – including governments - from developing countries as being in particular need of such capacity development. More recent research, conducted in late 2019[8] validated both the existing capacity development role of the IGF and its intersessional activities, as well as the strong belief among a wide variety of stakeholders that this role should be consolidated and expanded.[9]

2. Current IGF-based capacity development achievements

The IGF is already playing a substantial role in capacity development in Internet governance. This role is both implicit, through the IGF's character as community organised event that provides multiple opportunities for learning, knowledge sharing and networking. This is deepened (in terms of specific policy areas) through the Best Practice Forums (BPFs) and Dynamic Coalitions (DCs), and broadened through the National and Regional and youth IGF initiatives (NRIs), including the youth initiatives. Also, while only indirectly linked to the IGF, the growing body of schools of Internet governance have made a substantial contribution to growing knowledge, leadership and participation. The IGF Secretariat has also supported capacity development explicitly through their participation in NRIs and in Internet governanceschools as well as through providing direct or indirect support to these initiatives. The Secretariat has also developed tools and materials to support NRIs and it convenes regular online learning events that build knowledge, facilitate peer-learning, and provide support to NRI organisers on an ongoing basis. A further contribution from the Secretariat is through fellowships and internships.

Many respondents to the research conducted in late 2019 which forms the basis of this document, attributed their own growth in knowledge and understanding of Internet governance, and their increased confidence to participate in policy processes, to the IGF and/or NRIs (including youth initiatives). Several said that the learning opportunities provided by NRIs helped them participate effectively in the global IGF. Day zero, because it accommodates sessions that are longer and allow for in-depth discussion and learning, has also grown into a powerful capacity-building component of the IGF, for example, through sessions dedicated to topics such as policy and regulation for rural access and the annual Global Internet Governance Academic Network (GigaNet)[10] conference. Improvements to the IGF website has also contributed to capacity-building as has efforts from the MAG and the Secretariat to support session proposers through clearer guidelines and the creation of a workshop manual.

That other capacity-building efforts such as those of schools of Internet governance (SIGs), bodies such as the Internet Society, the Diplo Foundation and many civil society networks (e.g. the Association for Progressive Communications), link so closely to the IGF is further evidence of the

---

7   In response to these recommendations the third phase of the IGF's Project Document includes "*strengthened capacity of developing country stakeholders to participate effectively in Internet governance arrangements*" as an expected accomplishment. This document can be viewed at https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/4099/516

8   This research was commissioned by the IGF Secretariat in 2019 and forms the basis of this document.

9   Refer to the 2019 IGF capacity development needs assessment report linked to this document which is available on the IGF website.

10 https://www.giga-net.org/about/

value of the IGF as a platform for capacity development. The IGF provides a space that is relatively safe[11] for learning, and because it is linked to actual policy debates it comes packaged with the opportunity for learning to be put into practice.

Yet, the view that the IGF can do much more to contribute to capacity development is as widespread as the recognition of its existing contribution. Respondents made suggestions about how the IGF process can extend and amplify its capacity-building role and reach underrepresented and marginalised communities. They also provided useful advice on what the limitations are of some of the current capacity-building opportunities provided through the IGF process.

A concern was expressed about the emergence of "Internet governance tourists", referring to people who take advantage of capacity development and fellowship opportunities at the expense of people who have a long term commitment to the field. At the same time respondents acknowledged the need for diversity, inclusion, and creating opportunities for new people to become involved and many felt that the IGF has made great strides in achieving this.[12]

3. An IGF approach to Internet governance capacity development

Capacity development in the post-WSIS Internet governance context often means different things to different people. It is often seen as the solution to building more inclusive governance, particularly with regard to actors from the global South. While this view is widely accepted, it may lead to overlooking existing capacity in the global South. It may also lead to overlooking gaps in Internet governance knowledge and understanding in the global North. Cooperation in Internet governance that effectively addresses the many policy challenges this rapidly evolving sector entail, requires actors in the global North having a better understanding of the challenges facing developing regions, and vice versa. Moreover, many Internet policy challenges are global in nature and require collaborative responses. It follows that the assumption that Internet governance capacity-building is only needed by people who are new to Internet governance is fundamentally flawed. Internet governance experts generally have little understanding of development challenges and policy, for example. Many have no knowledge of the conditions in least developed countries (LDCs) and small island developing states (SIDS). Many only have a cursory understanding of human rights, or of telecommunications and media policy, not to mention gender. While the primary aim of the IGF capacity development programme is to respond to the needs of stakeholders from developing countries, particularly LDCs and SIDS, Internet governance stakeholders who are not from LDCs or SIDS also require capacity development if the IGF is to effectively respond to the needs of LDCs and SIDS and developing countries and contribute more widely to development. Add to this the evolving nature of Internet technology and policy challenges and you have a context in which new knowledge is constantly generated. Thus it follows that the IGF capacity development programme should not exclude stakeholders from the developed world.

---

11 This sense of safety applies in most cases but there are are some NRIs which are dominated by one stakeholder group in a manner that leaves others feeling unable to participate freely – for example in the case of NRIs that are convened by governments in countries or regions where rights to freedom of expression and association are not respected. Age and gender discrimination is also a concern from time to time and the openness and safety of the IGF as a platform for debate should not be taken for granted but be actively nurtured and assessed.

12 For detail on IGF Secretariat-supported capacity development activity refer to reporting under "Expected accomplishment 4: Strengthened capacity of developing country stakeholders to participate effectively in Internet governance arrangements" sections of annual IGF progress reports. They are available at https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/funding

Another common and view of Internet governance capacity development is to see it as a tool for overcoming difference in views. Positions such as lack of support for the multistakeholder approach among developing country governments are attributed to lack of knowledge and understanding when in fact - in many cases - it is rooted in political positions, not in lack of capacity. Such views can lead to capacity development initiatives designed to influence political views rather than enable people and institutions to develop their own, or to promote evidence-based approaches to Internet governance. Internet governance is political, and the terrain of Internet policy-making is filled with differences in power and influence. Credible capacity development needs to confront this and build awareness of this reality into its programming. Sensitivity to diversity is part of this. For example, by avoiding learning contexts where the majority of "learners" are women, and the majority of "teachers" are men.

Defining IGF-based capacity development

An IGF-based capacity development programme needs to have a clear understanding of what is meant by capacity-building, and of how to approach it in a manner that is consistent with IGF goals of inclusion. Capacity development in the context of Internet governance is multi-faceted and, at times, multi-disciplinary. It comprises growing knowledge of Internet governance broadly as well as specific aspects of Internet governance. It needs to build leadership and strengthen the ability of people and institutions to participate in Internet governance at the levels of both substance and process. It relates to influence and power – and the lack of influence and power.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) identifies three levels at which capacity can be grown and nurtured, which is well-suited to the context of Internet governance: "in an enabling environment, in organizations and in individuals". As strategic priorities for capacity development it proposes concentrating on **institutional arrangements and incentives**, **leadership**, **knowledge and accountability**. The UN Division for Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) – the IGF's institutional home in the UN – approaches capacity-building through partnership. Its strategy involves UNDESA acting as "an impartial generator, by disseminating and brokering knowledge, policy advice, and technical support in alignment with its mandate, departmental goals, and national priorities; and by creating effective platforms for learning and for sharing knowledge and experience among countries at the global, regional and national levels."[13] The IGF retreat adopted the UNDP definition which sees capacity development as "the process through which individuals, organizations and societies obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives over time".[14] Applying this to Internet governance results in the following definition:

> *IGF-based capacity development is the process through which individuals and institutions from all stakeholder groups, sectors and parts of the world, obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own Internet-related policy objectives over time.*

This approach seems most suited to an IGF capacity development programme that helps equip people, and thereby the institutions they are part of, to effectively understand and analyse policy contexts and enable them to make up their own minds, pursue choices and interests they identify with, while also understanding the choices and interests of others. Internet governance capacity-building must be continuous. New issues and challenges emerge constantly and one of the IGF's greatest successes has been the steady stream of newcomers who join every year. Capacity-building

---

13 https://www.un.org/development/desa/capacity-development/about/our-strategy/
14 p. 5 Capacity development: A UNDP primer, UNPD, 2009. http://www.undp.org/capacity

needs to be part of the continues long term IGF work programme responding to newcomers, but also to emerging and evolving challenges that both newcomers and "old-timers" have to address.

Capacity development content, peer-to-peer learning and networking

A key IGF strength is its facilitation of networking across regions and stakeholders, but also at national and regional level through NRIs, or among specific groups, such as young people. Where does networking stand in relation to capacity development? Based on the responses from respondents, network building is closely interconnected to capacity-building. Internet governance capacity involves building understanding of Internet governance as a sector and understanding of how Internet-related policy interacts with other spheres (e.g. economic development) as well as the positions and interests of different actors. Therefore, Internet governance capacity should **not only** be about the nuts and bolts, and the who's who of Internet governance. It should aim to connect Internet governance issues with outcomes that affect the lives and work of people and institutions who are not part of the Internet governance ecosystem in a narrow sense. This can be achieved through curriculum design, but also through designing of the programme and capacity development processes that contain a network building component. Peer-to-peer learning and networking - already strengths of the IGF - should be a methodological component of IGF-based capacity development.

IGF-based capacity-building also needs to address process issues, including the development of processes which are new and innovative and that respond to the specific characteristic of the Internet as public resource which is managed and developed by multiple stakeholders and institutions.

Capacity development and inclusion

Capacity-building is linked to inclusion. On its own it will not create more level playing fields or ensure more diversity in participation, e.g. women and gender-diverse people, people of colour, young people, people with different political views and people from a variety of disciplines. But the combination of capacity-building activities that foster diversity and awareness of the importance of inclusion at the IGF can achieve positive results, producing greater range and variety of people and perspective and thereby enriching IGF discussions and outcomes. IGF-based capacity development should consider inclusion it its design and implementation.

Prioritising under-represented and marginalized communities

As pointed out above, the need for Internet governance capacity development exists across the board, among all stakeholders and all regions. But a priority objective of the IGF-based capacity development programme is to increase the capacity of marginalised communities and participation of groups of people currently under-represented in Internet governance processes.

4. Guiding considerations for an IGF-based capacity development programme

Based on the discussion above, the extensive input received in the course of the research conducted to inform the development of this document which includes a needs assessment, the following points have emerged as useful considerations to keep in mind when designing and executing an IGF capacity development programme:

- **Dynamics of power, position and politics.** Capacity-building initiatives need to avoid being patronising by, for example, not acknowledging existing expertise in target countries and communities in the global South. Nor should they use capacity-building to promote a particular political approach – or, if they are aligned to, for example a particular foreign policy agenda of a donor country, this should be made transparent.

- **Capacity-building has to be a continuous process.** This is not to say that once-off events are not useful. It simply implies that, as outlined in the Tunis Agenda, IGF-based capacity-building has to be part of the long-term planning and evaluation of the IGF process (including for NRIs and other intersessional activity).

- **Internet governance capacity-building is about more than Internet governance.** IGF-based capacity development needs to do more than just cover a fixed list of Internet governancetopics; it also has to enable in-depth multidisciplinary understanding of Internet governance policy and regulation, and how this impacts people and institutions who are not part of the formal Internet governance sector.

- **Fellowships are not enough.** While the need for fellowships remain, and it is proposed that they form a part of the IGF's capacity-building activities, they are not sufficient. They address the problem of financial support for participation, but they do not, in most cases, provide capacity-building of genuine substance.

- **Learning events are not enough.** Just introducing workshops is not sufficient to enhance capacity sustainable over time. Relationship and network building, supported participation, mentoring, hands on experience etc. have to be part of an effective capacity development programme.

- **Participation vs. agenda shaping.** Marginalised and under-represented groups cannot be expected to participate more actively if the IGF agenda (including that of intersessional activities) does not reflect their interests and needs.

- **Understanding the technology matters.** In the ICT sector technical developments are rapid and continues, and therefore the technical knowledge needed by people involved in policy debate must be continuously updated. There is a wealth of information available online, but people consulted feel that it is often aimed at beginners, or, if not, is too detailed. What developing country stakeholders need most is for technical information to be presented in a way that is complex enough for them to use it to consider its relevance for their own contexts, and to engage meaningfully and critically in international debate.

- **Connect institutional capacity development to building the capacity of individuals**. One way to address this might be to focus on individuals but to require a commitment from the institutions in which they are based to support the capacity development effort and to make a contribution to it.
- **Leverage peer-to-peer learning** and conceive of peer relationships in a manner that allow them to cross borders, disciplines and stakeholder groups.
- **Connect capacity development at global level to regional, national and local levels.** It was suggested that the IGF process (which includes the NRIs) could facilitate follow-up discussions based on outputs and outcomes that can further contribute to capacity-building at national and local level post the global IGF. Some inputs built on this by proposing that capacity development should become part of the IGF intersessional process in a way that links with NRIs, BPFs, DCs and schools of Internet governance.

- **Enable Internet insiders and outsiders to *learn from each other.*** For example, when the IGF deals with themes such as sustainable development, gender inclusion, or climate change there is enormous value in bringing the Internet people together with people with specialised knowledge and experience in those areas. This approach would build directly on United Nations Secretary General Guterres' speech at the 2018 IGF in Paris, in which he referred to the importance of multidisciplinary engagement as a complement to the multilateral and multistakeholder approaches. This is also a model that NRIs can take up.

- **Diversity matters.** Language diversity, gender, geographic, level of knowledge etc. should be taken into account in the design and implementation IGF-based capacity development. Not doing so can unintentionally contribute to exclusion. This does not mean that every single capacity-building intervention needs to incorporate diversity in the same way through, to cite a bad example, a check list for regional representation. It simply means that the diversity challenges and needs of every effort should to be considered when planning and executing it.

- **Learning and evaluation is the basis of improvement.** Sustainable capacity development has to consciously get feedback and evaluation impact in order for those who design, implement and support these efforts to learn whether needs are being met. Therefore, learning and evaluation should be a part of the IGF's capacity development framework.

5. A framework for IGF-based capacity development

An IGF-based capacity development programme can be built based on a framework of **five interconnected pillars.** All five leverage the IGF's unique strength which include the massive and diverse international community of people and institutions that associate with the IGF and help shape and maintain it, the information gathering and sharing potential that this generates, the IGF's network and partnership building capacity and the IGF's identity as a non-aligned and multistakeholder process that also has linked to the United Nations and global intergovernmental initiatives such as the sustainable development agenda.

I. Providing access to information about Internet governance capacity development: Gathering and providing access to information about capacity-building opportunities, events, materials, courses, SIGs, internships etc.. This can be done through a database-driven website that is maintained collectively by the Secretariat and IGF stakeholders, particularly SIGs and DCs, and NRIs as well as partner institutions and networks such as the Diplo Foundation and GigaNet. Information provided on this site could include brief explainers on key Internet governance topics. Ideally, the newly established IGF wiki can be the source for this type of information. It could even provide a gateway to online courses and learning/training materials.

II. Mentoring: The IGF can play a role in connecting people who want to be mentored with people who would like to mentor others. The need for mentoring was mentioned specifically by people from youth IGF initiatives. Drawing on the resources of the global IGF, the NRIs, BPFs and DC s the IGF can facilitate the creation of a database of people available to act as mentors.

III. Supported participation (financial and capacity-building support): This can involve consolidating what is already happening through, for example, ISOC and Diplo programmes, host country-driven programmes, SIG programmes and through the many organisations who already provide "supported participation" such as, for example, ICANN, Deutsche Welle Akademie, and the Association for Progressive Communications.

IV. Learning events linked to the IGF process: Creating a one-stop-shop capacity-building track as part of the annual IGF cycle. It can include webinars throughout the year on specific topics/ IGF themes as well as face-to-face events linked to the annual Forum and NRIs. These learning events can be organised by BPFs, DCs, NRIs, or SIGs, and in some cases by the global IGF and the MAG in partnership with other institutions. If each active DC and each BPF were to organise one online learning event a year, that would already amount to between 15 and 20 events. Moreover, considering the diversity of the IGF community, it should be possible to have these events in multiple languages and time zones. This IGF capacity-building track can be made up of:

- Cluster one: Learning events related to the annual IGF themes/tracks.
- Cluster two: Learning events on general Internet governance topics, topics covered by DC s, BPFs, and NRIs.
- Cluster three: Awareness raising and outreach. This could include talks at universities and secondary schools, or at events that are not part of the insider Internet governance community.

V. Internships and professional exchanges: This can consist of professional exchanges for e.g. technical experts or management from government departments, regulators, or multistakeholder bodies from different countries. An IGF internship programme can place interns, drawing on people who have been part of, for example, the SIGs, at NRIs, and in the Secretariat of the global IGF. The IGF would not need to finance these exchanges directly as participating institutions could be asked to carry the cost of individual exchanges. However, it might be possible to interest IGF donors in supporting such a programme.

- Enhance and better communicate existing capacity development outcomes of the IGF.
- Make it easier to attract and manage resources earmarked for capacity-building.
- Better reach under-represented and marginalised communities.
- Strengthen IGF relationships with other institutions involved in capacity-building.
- Assess and measure the impact/needs of Internet governance capacity-building in the IGF context.

Specifically, such a framework can help achieve two of the expected outcomes outlined in the Tunis Agenda, the report of the WG on IGF improvements, the IGF retreat's recommendations, and the IGF Phase III project document.[15]

6. Operationalising an IGF-based capacity-building framework

As the IGF has limited resources, and as its strengths lie in the vast community of individuals and institutions it convenes, IGF-based capacity-building should, first and foremost, should build on existing initiatives and leverage strategic partnerships. But some dedicated resources are necessary. Implementing the IGF capacity development track will require additional effort from existing IGF mechanisms: the Secretariat, the MAG, BPFs, NRIs including youth initiatives, and DCs. It will also need active involvement of partners such as SIGs and other institutions involved in capacity development including in the UN system. All stakeholder groups have capacity development initiatives that can contribute. Lastly but not least, it will also require financial support. Leadership for different aspects of operationalising the IGF capacity-building framework is proposed below.

---

15 https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/4099/516

However, many of these can be undertaking collaboratively, or leadership assigned to different groups than those proposed.

Secretariat-led efforts

- **Coordination and relationship management.** This will require human resource capacity consisting of at least one person based at the IGF Secretariat[16]; a dedicated webspace (could be part of the intgovforum.org site); and online workspace.
- **Build a "one-stop-shop" capacity development information hub**, linked to the IGF website. This hub which can include crowd-sourced content can provide easy access to information about Internet governance-related capacity-building opportunities and activities from courses to fellowships and scholarships and internships. This hub will also **provide access to information about supported participation in the IGF process** in partnership with entities already committed to this.
- **Better communications and outreach.** Establish multi-lingual channels for communicating with everyone in the IGF community through newsletters, websites and distribution and discussion lists and a targeted social media strategy. Some channels exist and can be optimised like the IGF Newcomers mailing list which is rarely used at present. Others will have to be created.
- **Structured collaboration** with other dedicated capacity-building initiatives including SIGs. "Structured" here could involve memoranda of understanding rather than formal contractual agreements which are not easy for the IGF to enter into. It could also be in response to a call from the IGF for expressions of interest in capacity development partnerships. The goal here would be for the IGF to **partner with institutions and networks that conduct capacity-building as part of their core work.** Examples include Universities with Internet governanceprogrammes, the Diplo Foundation, schools on Internet governance (SIGs), GigaNet, institutions from the technical community like ICANN, ISOC, the IETF, ccTLDs, Regional Internet Registries, and private sector entities as well research institutions like Research ICT Africa, the Oxford Internet Institute to mention a few. There are also governmental and intergovernmental institutions that provide capacity-building that might want to partner with the IGF such as the International Telecommunications Union, the African Union, the Organisation of American States and other UN agencies like UNESCO and regional economic commissions. While led by the Secretariat the MAG will need to actively support this collaboration.
- **Add capacity development** to the terms of reference of DCs and BPFs and to NRI guidelines.
- **Developing a basic evaluation methodology** that can be used to evaluate IGF-based capacity development with a view to learning what works well and what can be improved.
- **Reporting on an annual IGF-based capacity-building strategy.** Such a strategy should prioritise target groups, e.g. young people, governments, people from small and medium enterprises, people from LDCs and SIDS.
- **Resource mobilisation.** Financial support, in-kind support and others forms of support will be needed and the Secretariat will have to coordinate ensuring sufficient resources are mobilised to operationalise the IGF capacity development programme. The basis of this can be the annual IGF capacity development strategy referenced below.
- **Facilitate a mentoring, internship and professional exchange "match-making" platform**. This could be executed by other entities through a strategic partnership

---

16 An example of the benefit of dedicating staff support is that of the NRIs, where having a Secretariat staff member focusing on working with the NRI community has produced very positive results. This can be replicated for capacity development.

agreement. Aspects of the 'match-making' could be part of the annual forum and NRI events by having face to face 'speed dating' sessions linked to IGF themes or emerging priorities.

MAG-led efforts

- **Establish an IGF-based capacity-building track** and produce an **annual capacity development track action plan.** Add a **capacity-building component to the global IGF** with learning events that take place on or before day zero. An annual MAG / IGF capacity development strategy can build on the thematic content of the annual IGF, and, based on that theme or themes, identify specific under-represented and marginalised communities to reach out to. This can be done through a MAG working group coordinated by the designated Secretariat coordinator and include representatives from strategic partner institutions. The MAG does not have to necessarily play a vetting role, but it can promote such events by including information about them in the IGF programme, similarly to how it does with day zero. Integration with the annual IGF thematic tracks can include asking the MAG to organise at least one webinar linked to main session topics, or thematic track narratives. Proposed speakers at main sessions can be asked to provide input during the webinars. It is important that this capacity development track provides learning and peer-learning opportunities to both beginners and experts in the IGF community.
- **Add structured learning or orientation sessions on global Internet governance for newcomers or specific stakeholder groups**, e.g. parliamentarians, or young people, environmental sustainability groups, women's rights and development groups. These learning events can be supported by people from those groups already active in the IGF and NRIs, DCs or BPFs, and focus on current trends and debates in global Internet governance. E.g. sessions for women's rights and development organisations and individuals can be run by organisations active in gender and Internet governance; and sessions for young people by youth actors who regularly present the IGF. This will allow for a better response and engagement from people from these disciplines or constituencies who are new to the IGF.
- **Integration with intersessional modalities.** One or more of the five pillars of the framework can be factored into the work of existing IGF processes such as NRIs, DC s and BPFs. BPF coordinators and support persons (usually a consultant) and lead experts (some BPFs have an assigned subject expert) can be asked to implement capacity development as part of their annual work cycle – optionally linked to IGF thematic tracks. Some are in fact already play a capacity development role through webinars. They can also be asked to identify actors not currently actively engaged, but who are affected by the topics they work on, and prioritise reaching out to them through webinars. The Secretariat can provide online meeting platforms for webinars.

NRI-led efforts

NRIs' have the potential to be far more than just a space for dialogue on national Internet governance priorities. Their multistakeholder and, in many cases multidisciplinary composition positions them as platforms for knowledge building and sharing. To enhance that they can:

- **More consistently convene or partner with others**, e.g. SIGs, technical community, universities, civil society organisations, businesses, governments and others to convene capacity-building workshops alongside NRIs (before or after).
- **Create space for youth IGF initiatives** to organise capacity-building pre-events.
- **Provide "on the job" learning opportunities for people from youth Internet governanceinitiatives** by including them in NRI planning committees or MAGs.

- **Ask participants to develop session proposals** and report on them in the way that the global IGF does, as this is a capacity-building exercise in its own right.

A concern was also expressed about NRIs as vehicles for a capacity-building programme based on the fact that they are often managed, and attended by groups of "insiders". This runs the risk of them becoming a kind of "Internet establishment" which can act as gatekeepers. Instead of providing a platform for diverse voices and interests, and facilitating debate, these 'gatekeeping' NRIs can end up telling people who are new to Internet governance, or who are from other sectors what they should think/want/need. They can use capacity development activity to be more open and inclusive.

As many NRIs lack resources and are themselves in need of capacity development they should be able to draw on support from the Secretariat and the MAG as they implement more capacity development activity.

Youth IGF-led efforts

Youth initiatives can be organisers of IGF-based capacity-building as well as beneficiaries. Youth initiatives create awareness, distribute information and provide a supportive, connected community. Youth IGFs are a powerful means to bring more young people into the conversation thereby bringing fresh perspectives to Internet policy discussions. The inclusion of youth in national regional and global IGFs also contributes to the reach of these events as young people are generally better able to make use of social media to share information and widen discussion beyond face-to-face events. As young people involved in Internet governance are often part of networks, or regional groupings, using their social links with one another to strengthen capacity-building can work well.
- **Organise regular webinars that link network building to capacity development.** One suggestion of a good practice that has worked well are interactive webinars that are focused on a given topic and happen regularly with the same group of young people. These can be recorded and then re-watched and shared with people. It builds networking and relationships and capacity.
- **Contribute to the IGF capacity development information hub.** Youth initiatives are well-networked and are expert in accessing information. They can be active contributors to the IGF web-based info hub and other communications and outreach vehicles.
- **Constitute youth as a stakeholder group** that can be represented in IGF activity, including capacity development, and participate in the annual capacity development planning process.

BPF-led efforts

- **Make capacity development part of BPF's intended outcomes and outputs**. They will need to be consulted on this to ensure the goals and activities are realistic.
- **Convene capacity-building activity** online and at face-to-face events where possible linked to the content of their annual work programme.

Dynamic Coalition-led efforts

Some Dynamic Coalitions are already doing capacity development. Dynamic Coalitions are independent and fully self-organised. However, they follow a terms of reference development the DC coordination group and are required to provide annual reports.

- **Include capacity development efforts in annual plans and reports.**
- **Share the information** about intersessional capacity development opportunities on the IGF capacity development hub.

Schools of Internet governance (SIGs)

SIGs are not formally part of the IGF but are closely linked to the IGF process. All respondents to the 2020 research on capacity development felt that SIGs should have a closer relationship with the IGF. Some regional SIGs are already closely connected with regional IGFs (Europe, Asia, Africa). SIGs were seen as, currently, playing an important role in capacity-building in a manner that supports the participation of alumni in the IGF and NRIs. They could also contribute to bringing a broader audience to Internet Governance debates. One suggestion made was that day zero training for the general public be provided by SIGs at NRIs. An advantage of a closer relationship with the SIGs is also that most of the SIGs update their curricula and material. IGF capacity development can benefit from this.

A gap in the SIGs relationship with the IGF that was pointed out is that most SIGs do not actively link to the global IGF's agenda. Some, e.g. the African School, include a session that orients participants to the agenda of the regional IGF. Now that the IGF thematic tracks are identified early on in the calendar year, it should be possible for SIGs to integrate sessions that are linked and for discussion of these themes at NRIs and SIGs to feed back into the global IGF process. Examples of efforts that SIGs – through the DC on SIGs - can initiative include:

- **Sharing a SIGs alumni list** with the IGF secretariat so that they can be considered as mentors to newcomers, panellists, or rapporteurs, among others roles that can support the participation of young people and underrepresented groups in the IGF.
- **Partner with the IGF to secure financial support for one or more participant from each SIG in the annual global Forum.**
- Volunteer to assist with the development of the annual IGF **capacity-building strategy.**
- **Contribute content** to the capacity development information hub including information on SIG faculty that can act as resource persons for IGF-based capacity development activity and materials and resources and curricula.

7. Next steps: Consultation, cooperation, implementation and resource mobilisation

Further consultation on the ideas proposed in this document is essential before they are put into practice. Those named as role-players should be given the opportunity to reflect and comment. So should those who provide financial support to the IGF and whose commitment over the long-term will be needed. Nevertheless, some of the proposals, such as the MAG and the IGF Secretariat adding a capacity building track to the 2020 IGF work programme or to add a capacity building track to the global event, can be put into practice in the short term. Developing a capacity-building strategy for 2020, even if a fairly rudimentary one, is an achievable goal. Partnerships could be utilised to minimise the need for additional resources.

Building an IGF basic capacity development information hub will require additional time and resources, but, it could be integrated into existing plans to strengthen IGF communications. However, coordination and relationship-building will require dedicated attention at the level of the

IGF Secretariat and mobilising resources for a capacity development coordinator should be prioritised.

Consultation remains the most important place to start as it also presents an opportunity to begin to build cooperation, relationships, strategic partnerships, good will, and mobile financial and in-kind resources – all of which are vital to the success of a sustainable IGF capacity development programme.