

| Question | Answer |
|--|---|
| Country | Uganda |
| Organization Name | UGANDA COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION |
| Email | rmukite@ucc.co.ug |
| Telephone | +256784361739 |
| 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? | Yes, I support it. It is important to a great extent. |
| In what ways would a new/ improved model promote actionable outcomes? | It would promote actionable outcomes by having clear transparent and quantifiable responsibilities for each of the different stakeholders. |
| 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? | Broader participation of Governments, LDCs and SMEs can be better ensured by creating and communicating to known national and regional focal points. This would cater for the current absence of common synergies at the national and regional level. Yes; the UN has a great role in this. It can draw on its high convening power at both governments, private sector and development partners; to bring them all to the table in an organised way. |
| What means of implementation are required for a sustainable system? | 1. Clearly set and well-negotiated targets or goals. 2. Clear responsibilities/contribution of each stakeholder mapped to the set targets/goals. 3. Well, coordinated and intentional corporation between dependant actions and initiatives. 4. Goals and targets should be set and well tiered, both vertically within the UN system and horizontally with all other stakeholders. |
| What structure, membership and responsibilities could a new Advisory Group have? What are its potential benefits compared to the current MAG? | 1. The structure should have a fair balance of international institutionalisation at the policy level; to especially cater to the cross-jurisdictional nature and public policy issues of the internet. 2. The technical structure should be based on soft law- to define a minimum acceptable technical code of conduct that should provide guidance at the least at a regional level. The xix and match would complement the existing framework of the current MAG, with more binding and actionable outcomes. |
| What are your thoughts on the following proposals? What structure, membership and responsibilities should each have? - Cooperation Accelerator - Policy Incubator - Observatory and Help Desk | Corporation accelerator - should be based on a more self-regulatory structure that allows enough flexibility for innovation and willing good. Policy Incubator - should be based on a regional institutionalised international law to create at the least regionally binding policy initiatives and direction. The assumption is that the governments within a given geographical region should at the least have commonalities in of common policy direction to drive growth, across the region. the Observatory and help desk should be institutionalised to cater for efficiency and balance in all the relevant stakeholders and partners. |
| 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? | The IGF trust fund should cater for: 1. Research- the institution should be able to carry out research and also support governments, regions and other stakeholders in-depth research to support the decisions and directions undertaken. 2. Capacity building especially in LDCs in both cross-jurisdictional technical, regulatory and internet public policy issues. 3. Fund a global Tribunal to settle cross-jurisdictional issues related to internet public policy issues. |
| 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? | 1. The creation of "Issue-specific" digital cooperation networks means that all work related to a prevalent digital issue would be handled by the highest level of global expertise and fully inclusive process and as such all issues would be put on the table exhaustively. 2. The stable nature of the Network support platforms would create a process of learning from previous or past experiences of supporting previous issue-specific digital cooperation networks. This past experience creates a library of "What worked" and "What didn't work".. Over time this experience translates in the efficiency of achieving outcomes. 3. The Network of networks would have a clear separation of the technical outcomes of the digital cooperation networks and the implementation of the same. |
| 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? | 1- The "digital cooperation networks" should ideally be based on soft law or self-regulatory measures in order for them to have an environment that encourages innovation and objective discussion and articulation of all issues. 2. in order for the "Network support platform" to be sustainable; it should be highly institutionalised to create stability in structure and accountability and efficiency in operation. The Network of Networks should ideally have the same institutionalised structure as the Network support Platforms. |
| What existing networks, if any, fit the necessary prerequisites of transparency, inclusion, multistakeholderism, to serve as pilots for COGOV? | ICANN, IETF, IEEE, ALL Regional telecommunications bodies, |
| How would the COGOV Architecture contribute to the development of digital norms? | 1. High levels of interdisciplinary expertise on a given prevalent digital issue would lead to the creation and adoption of minimum codes of conduct\ guidelines and self-check standards in an environment of Unity of purpose on the intended or desired outcome for common good on the public policy internet issues |
| What gaps in the existing digital architecture would the Digital Commons model address? | 1.The creation of project-oriented and result based working groups would ensure actionable outcomes on prevalent digital cooperation issues that they would be working to address. Because of the time-bound nature of the projects. 2. The international "commons" structure would create more binding international internet public policy outcomes. 3. Creation of multistakeholder specialised institutions under the auspices of the UN would ensure that ALL stakeholders are on board and thus the process would be more inclusive with very intentional actions for all groups including, children, women, the youth and persons with specific needs. |
| Which aspects/features of the proposed architecture should be further considered? | 1. Multi-stakeholder tracks led by a UN agency, or multistakeholder forum with a choice of participants governed by clearly defined principles. 2. The international 'commons' nature on specific cross-jurisdictional internet public policy issues would create more binding treaty like guidelines on best practice on prevalent issues. |
| Do you see scope for combining the three models and if yes, how could this be operationalized | the Digital commons Architecture has elements of both the IGFplus and CoGOV architectures. it seems to draw the best of both; with a good balance in soft law in terms of the multistakeholder forums under a lead organisation that would bring all stakeholders on board on a specific prevalent digital cooperation issue. This would create inclusion and foster more coordinated cooperation on a given issue. |
| 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"? | 1. Humanity 2. transparency 3. Trust 4. Cooperation 5. Consensus building 6. Fairness |
| 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? | 1. The key role of the UN is its already existing multistakeholder structure that brings both the global private and public sectors together. 2. The high-level all-inclusive convening power of the UN to drive inclusivity. 3. Coordination of the funding partners |
| Which other ideas, mechanisms and features are worth considering? | |