

Input from Sylvia Cadena. APNIC Foundation.

1: Introduction to Roundtable

I did not participate at a roundtable as explained above.

2: Assessment of the Recommendation

Regarding recommendation 5A. I support the recommendation of an agile and open consultation process to take place. However, I would like to urge the UN SG and the Champions to review the proposed timeline to allow for a consultation process that is really meaningful. The online mechanisms available to submit our own contributions are available, but it will be really useful to incorporate into that platform the possibility for all of us to show our support to what other people have said (the equivalent of +1 to when you participate in mailing lists and conference calls to express your support to build on your colleagues comments and inputs).

I believe that it will be a great idea to use the UN 75th anniversary for a global commitment for digital cooperation, as an awareness campaign across all UN organizations and events, in particular to link them to WSIS and the IGF. However, I would caution against launching new ones as that effort will take considerable resources from the processes that the community has worked so hard to contribute to. I welcome the idea to appoint a Technology Envoy to bring more attention to the challenges of digital cooperation to achieve the SDGs. It will be very important that such appointment considering candidates from the global south, coming from an SME background that has a track record of designing products, applications or services that really respond to community needs. The worst that could happen for a process like this, will be to end up with a Silicon Valley “ambassador” of sorts. The appointment of the Technology Envoy can send a very clear signal about what digital cooperation actually means and how it translates into solutions to achieve the SDGs.

Regarding recommendation 5B, we support “a multi-stakeholder “systems” approach for cooperation and regulation that is adaptive, agile, inclusive and fit for purpose for the fast-changing digital age” noting that:

- The “Distributed Co-Governance Architecture” option is interesting for its flexibility and voluntary participation. However those same elements make it difficult to understand which may be a deterrent for people to engage effectively. If elements of this option are to be taken forward it is really important to guarantee it will not duplicate existing work.
- The “Digital Commons Architecture” option also has interesting elements, but it seems to me that it requires a very evolved framework about who owns the infrastructure where the “digital cooperation” will indeed take place.
- Out of the three options, I strongly support the proposal to strengthen the IGF, as a well-established platform with a clear UN mandate. It has a strong reputation of being open, multi-stakeholder and multidisciplinary space. The IGF has a strong community that have made concrete recommendations to improve the IGF and are willing to work on the ones also listed on the HLPDC report.

3: Approach that the Secretary-General should take to the Recommendation: (areas below are suggestions only; Champions can decide which are most appropriate/relevant)

- Is there agreement with the Recommendation, as currently worded?
- Is there a need to amend or change the Recommendation and if so how?

Yes, I believe the recommendations wording should be reviewed through a community validation process. Please see comment outside of the table.

Connecting with ongoing initiatives

- Mapping of existing activities and/or planned initiatives, existing international (or UN) platforms or forum/fora, if any
- Suggesting initiatives or examples of best practices that would benefit from encouragement by the Secretary-General

I think these two questions are a bit ahead of the process, as the mapping is proposed to be undertaken by the observatory.

Recommendations and Proposals

- Providing direction on how the Recommendation could be achieved, including possible priority areas or objectives
- Suggesting possible areas of action, including by the UN or other parts of the global community that the Secretary-General could call for, or that the United Nations as an organization could support
- Scope, principles or norms that such potential areas of action should keep in mind

Please see my responses to #5.

4: Key upcoming milestones or opportunities

- Key milestones or meetings for further discussion/work on Recommendation, from now till the end of the year 2020 (or even after)
- Information about the milestones or meetings (e.g. purpose of the meeting, target audience, level of participants, expected outcome, relevance, etc)

With the cancellations of so many meetings, it will be advisable to look for online tools and platforms to advance the understanding of the recommendations and how they are progressing. The calendar of NRI events should be the start, adding the events per stakeholder group.

5: Any other comments/advice to the Secretary-General

I would like to offer the following views using the questions that were formulated by the HLIG of the European Commission. I think those questions make a lot of sense. Maybe an online survey could be more suitable to gather input.

- How could the new model foster more actionable outcomes?

I think the IGF has made considerable efforts in the past couple of year to map in a more efficient way, the concrete and actionable outcomes that come out of the event. This exercise should continue by strengthening the design of a reporting platform so that not only session organizers report about what happens in the sessions but also making it easy for participants to continuously report how their participation at the IGF (event, intersessional activities, etc) has support the development of their regulatory frameworks, projects, initiatives, etc.

- How can broader participation of government and business representatives, especially from small and developing countries and SME's be ensured?

Personalized letters from the UN SG office addressed at the local level, not only to the permanent missions in Geneva, but to the all heads of state, ministries and departments in every country that works under the UN framework to include the event in their calendars and use their own travel budgets to participate as well as to identify a list of local stakeholders for their own country as they know who should be the best, more influencing players in every country to join. Funding is

not the only issue, is the fact that they don't have such process/event in the agenda and they have not secure support to join. Many organizations fund and operationalized their own fellowships processes to attend the IGF and that will continue to happen, but a letter of encouragement from the UN SG thanking them for their support and encouraging to continue to do it will also go a long way. It seems that for many organizations, their efforts go unnoticed.

- How can a stable financial funding be ensured?

The IGF should not be an extra budgetary project that will be the very first step in the search for a stable funding source as that will be the anchor for other governments and stakeholders to contribute to the trust fund. It will be important to review the current IGF budget document and try to break it down into projects that the secretariat can lead so that funding to support such projects is used to strengthen the secretariat functions and respond to community needs. A well-structured campaign for fundraising is required and to start, it will be advisable to engage the chairs of the HLPDC panel, to show the way to others and encourage donating to the IGF Trust Fund. It does not have to be a lot, but if they "walk the talk" it will be easier to raise funds for the IGF. Currently, is not very clear who leads those fundraising efforts.

- Do you think the Advisory Group is a useful proposal and if yes, how should it look like? Especially in terms of its composition/membership, responsibilities? To what extent should there be differences to the current MAG?

I think it is a good idea. It will be an opportunity to review the mandate of what the MAG does (which at the moment is very wide) as well as to review its structure and time commitment. I think the AG could keep the same number of members that the MAG currently has, and look for geographic and stakeholder representation same as the MAG composition does. However, it is of absolute importance that the selection process for AG members is more transparent and that takes into account the independent processes that every stakeholder group has to nominate members to the MAG. Currently that process is not really well incorporated into the MAG appointments and there are members that are representing stakeholders for which they are not part of. It will be also very important to review and advertise the definitions of what stakeholder groups people represent. At the moment the voices of the technical community and academia are merged into something that does not reflect or correspond with the reality of their contributions to the digital technologies development and on the HLPDC report there is a lot of confusion around who develops standards -just as an example- and how to secure participation of such stakeholders. I believe that technical community organizations that provide the basis for digital technologies to be developed must have a permanent seat in the AG, even if the representative rotates. If it is in the interest of the UN SG to include more SMEs a new stakeholder category should be added to clearly address the fact that currently they are included as part of the private sector stakeholder group. My suggestion will be to structure the AG around the following categories that more accurately represent the stakeholders that are developing the infrastructure, content, services and platforms in the digital world: 1) governments; 2) civil society (non-profit organizations); 3) academia (universities, research institutions); 4) technical community (organizations working on standards, domains, IP number allocation and mobile infrastructure development); 5) media (associations that represent journalists, content producers, etc); UN agencies and intergovernmental organizations; 6) SMEs; 7) Technology companies (1 year only); 8) private sector (an emphasis on including ISPs of different sizes and mobile operators will be important).

- Do you think the Cooperation Accelerator is a useful proposal and if yes, how should it look like? Especially in terms of its composition/membership as well as its responsibilities?

- Do you think the Policy Incubator is a useful proposal and if yes, how should it look like? Especially in terms of its composition/membership as well as its responsibilities?

In response to the 2 questions above, the MAG should play a more strategic role. Rather than setting up a new “cooperation accelerator” and “policy incubator”, the MAG should undertake many of these functions, identifying issues and convening discussion using existing mechanisms like the Dynamic Coalitions to foster cooperation and the BPFs to incubate policy solutions. In order to do that, the MAG needs more powers to ensure greater quality control and the design of the program needs to consider not only community submissions but current research and outcomes from other UN processes so that discussions at the IGF are evidence based, and linked to other processes.

- Do you think the Observatory and Help Desk are useful proposals and if yes, how should they look like? Especially in terms of its composition/membership as well as its responsibilities?

The IGF secretariat should be supported to take on this roles and with them, the necessary budget to continue and expand their mapping and capacity building efforts around IG. The wording around the help desk responsibilities on the report, however, seems to be ignoring the existence of many civil society organizations and alliances/partnerships that do exactly that. It will probably be more useful if the IGF secretariat, strengthen through mapping and analysis platforms and working closely with the stakeholders involved find a way to be an effective broker between those with needs for policy advice and those that can assist, while also offering case studies and analysis.

- Should a new IGF Trust Fund be considered? If yes, how should it look like, what expenses should it cover and –accordingly-what financial volume would it need (annual budget)?

In principle, I would say no. The existing Trust fund should be reviewed and strengthen to be able to operationalize these changes, but if its legal structure does not allowed it then a new one should be structured accordingly.

- How can stakeholders be encouraged to contribute to an IGF Trust Fund? How should contributions to a trust fund be structured: multistakeholder-wise, geographically, and institutionally?

As mentioned above, a more effective fundraising campaign is required. The local host should commit -as part of the bid to host a meeting- at least 5% of the budget they have secured to host the event to go towards the Trust Fund to support the secretariat. NRIs and schools of Internet Governance, as well as individuals attending an event, should be also asked to contribute even symbolical amounts of \$1 for those in developing countries to reinforce the idea that “every dollar counts”. Stakeholders should be provided with a menu of options to allocate their funding, as what many of them can’t do, is to contribute without a clear understanding of weather their funding is used in alignment with their own priorities.

- Which other ideas, mechanisms and features are worth considering?

The IGF needs a very -very- professional machine to identity, document, curate and publish outcomes. A considerable investment is needed in the platforms and system they have at their disposal. The IGF should consider the addition of the “Friends of the IGF” website as the official search engine for the proceedings of the event and to run an aggressive campaign to get session

organizers to join this crowdsource effort to tag sessions appropriately, add information about a session, link it to reports and articles etc.

- Do you see elements of combining the three models and if yes, how could this be operationalized?

I think the 3 options have very different ideas in mind and it will be very difficult to articulate them. Maybe the IGF+ could have a “sandbox” to offer some space as part of the intersessional activities and the event to test innovative approaches.