

Question	Answer
Country	Kingdom of Bahrain
Organization Name	Ministry of Transportation and Telecommunications
Email	telecom@mtt.gov.bh
Telephone	00973 17337878
Do you support the recommendation of a multistakeholder ‘systems’ approach for cooperation and regulation that is adaptive, agile, inclusive and fit for purpose for the fast-changing digital age? To what extent is the “multistakeholder” aspect important?	We do support the recommendation of a multistakeholder systems approach. The multistakeholder aspect is important in order to obtain the views of all stakeholders and ensure inclusiveness. However, this does not equate to equal decision making power. Each group of stakeholders have their own rights and responsibilities (e.g. sovereign rights of nations with regards to policy and regulation).
In what ways would a new/ improved model promote actionable outcomes?	It would provide for a dynamic and fast information sharing platform and it can provide inclusive and comprehensive opinion(s) which can be considered by decision-makers in the course of their decisions and actions. It would promote actionable outcomes by ensuring that the right rationales and cross-sector consideration is undertaken in a timely and effective manner. We understand the term ‘actionable outcomes’ to mean ‘clear to implement’, but should not impinge on sovereign rights of nations.
How can broader participation of government and business representatives, particularly from small and developing countries and SMEs, be ensured? Is there a role for the UN?	The topics to be discussed must be relevant to current concerns of small and developing countries and SMEs. Additionally, the cost and complexity of participation should be minimized in order to lower the barriers of participation. Yes, there is a role for the UN and/or the ITU in providing a unified and inclusive global platform for all stakeholders. The role of the UN and/or ITU should be clear in all cases.
What means of implementation are required for a sustainable system?	The creation of virtual platforms for ongoing discussions may help attract further participation of all relevant stakeholders, as an example.
What structure, membership and responsibilities could a new Advisory Group have? What are its potential benefits compared to the current MAG?	As a point regarding the broader structure and role of IGF, we believe that there is a benefit to having a broad multistakeholder discussion in order to listen to differing and varied views. However, the current structure of the IGF does not lend itself well to deep discussions nor to clear opinions, recommendations and/or best practices. In order for an IGF+ to be relevant in the current time, it would need to be able to discuss sensitive and controversial issues of relevance in a timely and thoughtful manner, and provide suggestions on actions for relevant stakeholders. This is particularly important for issues of cross-border relevance such as data flow, privacy and cybersecurity.
What are your thoughts on the following proposals? What structure, membership and responsibilities should each have? - Cooperation Accelerator - Policy Incubator - Observatory and Help Desk	With regards to the above functions, we have no objection to the proposed functions, as long as they do not infringe upon sovereign rights and responsibilities. We also understand that ranking, measuring and mapping will be done in other, existing fora.
What are your thoughts on a new IGF Trust Fund? If considered, how should it look like, what expenses should it cover, and—accordingly—what annual budget would it need?	Further information is required in order to provide meaningful comments.
What gaps in the existing digital architecture could the COGOV model address? What are its potential benefits compared to the business-as-usual scenario? How might it interact with existing mechanisms?	With regards to gaps and potential benefits, a COGOV model could provide the necessary guidance, dynamism and inclusivity to provide useful inputs to governments for their consideration on matters of concern in a timely manner. The COGOV model could leverage existing international/regional organisations and fora to facilitate the discussions under the umbrella of this Digital Cooperation initiative.
What structure, membership and responsibilities could the distributed co-governance mechanism take on? How might principles governing the logical and infrastructure layers be applied in economic and social layers of governance?	We support the proposed structure, membership and responsibilities of the COGOV mechanism as outlined on page 33 of the UN Report.
What existing networks, if any, fit the necessary prerequisites of transparency, inclusion, multistakeholderism, to serve as pilots for COGOV?	Further consideration on this is required, particularly once the final framework is agreed. Any candidate networks will likely require some adjustment in order to implement the agreed framework.
How would the COGOV Architecture contribute to the development of digital norms?	Please refer to our answer in Question 12.
What gaps in the existing digital architecture would the Digital Commons model address?	The Digital Commons model, as outlined on page 34 of the UN Report, is not clear. Further clarity on the model, funding, scope of responsibility and expected outcomes are required before comments are provided.
Which aspects/features of the proposed architecture should be further considered?	The concept of ‘Digital Commons’ (albeit, not in the format outlined in the report) could be considered for matters of global interest which require a unified global approach/response to.
Do you see scope for combining the three models and if yes, how could this be operationalized	Each proposal has certain points of relevance and interest. These could be combined into the final framework. However, the various permutations are too varied to fully list out and would ultimately depend on the core framework agreed upon.
What are key shared values, principles, understanding and objectives for a global digital cooperation architecture that should be included in a “Global Commitment for Digital Cooperation”?	We believe that such principles should include trust; protection and security; respect for sovereign rights and responsibilities; inclusiveness. Objectives may include enabling digital transformation on a national, regional and global level; willingness for open and respectful cooperation and dialogue in order to achieve actionable opinions/recommendations.
What role do you see for the UN in the future of global digital cooperation? What would the profile, responsibilities and role of a Technology Envoy (to be appointed by the UN Secretary-General) be?	The UN could act as a facilitator for global discussions. The UN Report does not provide clarity on the expected role and benefit of appointing a Technology Envoy. Further elaboration is required.
Which other ideas, mechanisms and features are worth considering?	None at this time.