



OPERATING EUROVISION AND EURORADIO

EBU REPLIES TO Questions guiding the Follow-up Process of the Report of the UN High Level Panel on Digital Cooperation, Recommendations 5A/5B HLIG meeting 28 January 2020

A) Overarching questions on a future digital cooperation structure concerning all models

1. How could the new model foster more actionable outcomes?

- **Continue raising the political relevance and profile of the IGF**
- **Unifying the tracks of the IGF and of the WSIS under a common umbrella lead by the UN SG.**
- **The personal participation of the UN Secretary General**
- **The appointment of a Tech Envoy by the UN Secretary General identified as the clear focal point of the whole process and the person in charge of the follow-up of the IG work.**
- **The personal participation of the Host Country President or Head of Government to IG events (IGF, but also of ministers in WSIS, etc.).**
- **A clear multi-year agenda planned for the whole mandate of the UN GA (2025) with one main topic to be dealt in-deep every year.**
- **Visibility of the whole process through traditional media remains fundamental to convince everybody (governments, industry, civil society...) that this is a debate they cannot miss or stay away from.**
- **One mid-term objective would be to develop Recommendations as envisaged by §72 of the Tunis Agenda on the Information Society (TAIS), as non-negotiated, rough consensus and/or options documents.**

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

Governments could be better reached through regional or worldwide associations such as EU, OECD, G7 or G20, African Union, ASEAN and so on. We need to get on board these intermediaries in order to reach their already existing networks.

Business representatives could be better reached through their regional and national associations. IIC represent only a small fraction of this world: only companies with a transregional or global scope.

A broader participation may be incentivized by the establishment of a high level MAG, with a strategic advisory function, formed by representatives of organizations at decision-making level (see below).

3. How can a stable financial funding be ensured?

We need to think to mechanism of partnership, creating liaisons officers through the various agencies and associations involved in the process and devolve some part of the work to these networks, instead then creating new central bodies.

Increasing effectiveness and relevance of IG debate through the UN remains the most important tool that will increase the willingness to fund and to contribute to the IGF.

By bringing high-level representatives to a high-level MAG the corresponding organizations may feel a stronger incentive to finance the IGF (see below).

B) Internet Governance Forum Plus (IGF +)

4. 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?

Yes it is. But the appointments of the MAG members need to be made in function of the long term plans of the IGF and in agreement with the multi-stakeholder regional groups that need to be involved in the programme. If IGF + 2023 will focus on child pornography, you need to have representative of those that could help to solve that issue (social media companies, child protections NGOs, law enforcement agencies); the same if 2024 will focus on spam and so on.

The Advisory Group could take the form of a permanent but rotating high-level MAG. The high-level MAG could be in line with the numbers, distribution and periodic rotation of seats existing in the current MAG. This “high-level” MAG would convene a manageable number of leaders from all stakeholder groups at head of organization level. This group would meet at least once F2F during the annual IGF and could be chaired by UN-Secretary General or an immediate appointee of the UNSG. It could provide strategic input to the IGF annual program; act as coordination accelerator network in case of urgent issues (i.e. “respond calls”); provide input on draft principles, orientations, guidelines and recommendations prepared by Policy Incubator Networks.

In addition, the MAG would maintain –in a technical level format- the main task of developing and preparing the IGF annual meeting (“program committee”).

In parallel also the participation of the International organizations to the MAG needs to be reinforced and enhanced. If child porn is one of the topics, UNICEF needs to be there and represented at the highest possible level.

5. 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?

The high-level MAG could act as coordination accelerator network in case of urgent issues (i.e. “respond calls”) linked to the IGF pluriannual strategy; as such the high-Level MAG could provide input on draft principles, orientations, guidelines and recommendations prepared by Policy Incubator Networks. The Observatory Network as well as a strengthened IGF Secretariat would contribute and support such efforts.

6. 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?

Current DCs, BPFs and external policy networks (willing to do so) could be evolved into policy incubator networks (PINs) and offered stronger support by the IGF-Secretariat as well as the Observatory/Helpdesk Network. Thematic discussions on the proposals of PINs could also be a feature of a more structured annual program, which would further strengthen the approach of having a limited number of politically, socially and economically highly relevant thematic tracks.

The intersessional work from policy incubator networks (PINs) should have stronger linkages to the high-level MAG. The high-level leaders should also be able to propose the establishment of new PINs or request existing ones to address emerging/urgent needs. In this sense, high-level leaders would intersessionally and/or at its annual forum discuss draft PIN principles, orientations, guidelines and recommendations and make inputs to the PINs. By being linked in these ways to the high-level leaders the PINs would count with direct connection to the relevant decision-makers, which, in turn, would enhance the visibility, tangibility and relevance of their work.

7. 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+ Observatory and Helpdesk function would be performed by a network of helpdesks/observatories willing to perform that task, which would closely cooperate with a strengthened IGF-Secretariat (such as the GIPO of the EC or the GIP of the Swiss federation or the European Audiovisual Observatory of the Council of Europe, or the future Observatory against the fake news of the EU).

The Helpdesk/Observatory Network should serve as a “one-stop-shop” for all stakeholders, but especially from small and developing countries and on a needs-based basis, in order to enable their meaningful participation;

The Observatory/Helpdesk Network should:

- **provide updated information on relevant issues, processes and actors;**
- **connect interested actors with each another and provide support for organizing as Policy Incubator Networks;**
- **provide capacity-building for interested stakeholders on relevant issues in the field of digital cooperation enabling them to meaningfully participate in IGF and/or direct to appropriate capacity-building resources;**
- **direct requests for help on digital policy (such as dealing with crisis situations, drafting legislation, or advising on policy) to appropriate entities, including regional and sector-specific helpdesks;**
- **ensure links between governance processes and implementation of SDGs;**
- **collect and share best practices.**

The IGF-Secretariat may assume a role of first point of contact for the Helpdesk/Observatory Network.

More about the Helpdesk concept:

The idea of the help desk it's useful idea but it also needs to build on what already exists within regional organizations and international institutions. Wherever possible, it would be important to empower (for instance) the African Union to provide these services to its members, or WHO regional offices (for digitalization of health processes) instead than creating totally new tools. The same – for the above-mentioned reasons – should apply to media and locally based content and services. Each government must be provided with best practices, legislative tools and a suggested set of checks and balances in order to ensure a safe environment for citizens' dialogue.

8. 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)?

- By linking stakeholder leaders to the IGF+ through the high-level MAG or group and by increasing the relevance and added value of the work done by the PINs the incentive and pressure to devote funding to the IGF would naturally increase.
- The mid-term goal would reach a funding span between 3-6 Million USD per year (annual meeting not included), which should be more than enough to cover the costs of the whole system, including appropriate travel-support for less well-resourced stakeholders. (for current budget and needs see: https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/9615/1961)
- Funding should be multistakeholder including support from member states, technical sector, foundations, media and private companies.
- The IGF Secretariat's staff would need to be increased and strengthened so as to properly serve the policy and administrative support needs of the enhanced IGF framework.

9. 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?

NO VIEW ON THIS

C) Distributed Co-Governance Architecture (COGOV)

10. Which aspects/features of the proposed architecture „COGOV“ should be further considered?

We don't believe that a new structure needs to be created. We believe that IGF+ structure -through the MAG- will have to be empowered to ask (on the basis of its multi-year plan) the support of one of the existing "horizontal networks" within the Internet Galaxy. For instance, for the problem of find a solution to spam or to fishing, MAG could ask to IETF or other similar, how to deal with that phenomenon. Of course, to ensure that such access exists and could be activated when needed, liaisons officers and functions need to be established with the relevant examples of these "horizontal networks".

D) Digital Commons Architecture

11. Which aspects/features of the proposed architecture should be further considered?

As WBU (World Broadcasting Unions) we are one of the common architectures existing at the global level. And the same exists for other media organizations (printed media, community radio, etc.). So we should be one of these examples of digital common architecture to be used as resources or partners in such process.

E) Other Ideas

12. Which other ideas, mechanisms and features are worth considering?

The whole UN HLP DC report has a blind spot, and this concerns the future of media in digital era. As we forewarned, the absence of media expertise within the Panel has led inevitably to scant consideration of the impact that the digital transformation will have on media and the knock-on effect of this on societies.

The crucial role of media needs to be incorporated into the follow-up as well as into future actions and mechanisms. The report stresses the risk of a new social divide between 'digital' and 'non-digital' citizens. How is it possible to bring on board those who have been 'left behind' if not they are no longer in school? Surely, for adults, the media is the only solution.

Additionally, the report stresses the risk that some cultures, languages or people groups will be left out in the cold after failing to keep up with the digital transformation. Another threat relates to the fact that the digital transformation is a collective effort, championed by a society that is cohesive and united. Such an endeavor may be impossible if a society is made up of fragmented, polarized and self-centered interests' groups.

Without new digital media, whose task is to reunify society and overcome differences, all these risks could well become the reality of tomorrow, transforming our bright digital future into a foreboding dystopia.

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

Yes. We have plenty of ideas and we are ready to discuss in the follow up public debate that has been announced.

Giacomo Mazzone
Head of Institutional Relations at EBU