
PHASE 1 SYNTHESIS REPORT OF PHYSICAL CONSULTATION EVENTS

**UNESCO'S PROJECT TO DEFINE
INTERNET UNIVERSALITY INDICATORS**
(PHASE 1: MARCH-NOVEMBER 2017)

1. Brief review of the results and impact: 24 consultations events in 21 countries	p. 1
2. Summary chart of key suggestions including proposed indicators and recommendations made	p. 4
3. Narrative description of the elaborate inputs made for the five categories of indicators	p. 7
Annex 1: A list of the face-to-face consultation events and related press releases	p. 17
Annex 2: Pictures of selected events	p. 19

1. Brief review of the results and impact: 24 consultation events in 21 countries

As part of key methodology to develop Internet Universality indicators, UNESCO (in partnership with a consortium led by APC) has held a series of face-to-face discussions at international meetings and in individual countries. From March to November 2017, a total of 24 consultation events have been convened in 21 countries, covering all UNESCO regions (Africa, Arab States, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean). This is a major and useful complement to the online consultation process which was launched in parallel in June 2017.

These face-to-face activities represented an important contribution to the project, providing UNESCO with valuable suggestions from interested stakeholders, and boosting the number of online submissions. They have also facilitated and expanded UNESCO's partnerships and synergies with stakeholders in implementing Internet Universality principles and applying Internet indicators in different countries once they are developed.

Having engaged with thousands of stakeholders in this phase of consultation, UNESCO has widely advocated its new concept of Internet Universality as well as a R.O.A.M- based Internet (Rights, Openness, Accessibility and Multi-stakeholder participation) which can make an optimum contribution to the 2030 Agenda of Sustainable Development Goals. UNESCO has also flagged its leading role in developing such a recognised and authoritative global research tool, which can serve to enrich the various stakeholders' capacity for assessing Internet development, broaden international consensus and evidence-based dialogue, and foster online democracy and human rights towards knowledge societies engaged in sustainable development.



A full list of the face-to-face consultation events can be found here and in Annex:
<https://en.unesco.org/internetuniversality/consultations-at-events>

These consultations were meant to publicize the project, and to engage with different stakeholders – from Member States, governments, international organizations, technical community, private sector, civil society and NGOs, Internet and legal experts, academia, journalists and media experts to students and civil society groups. The aim has been to gather their inputs on broad values as well as on the framework of the Internet indicators.

Precisely, these events were convened during:

- **Global fora:** RightsCon (Brussels, Belgium); Stockholm Internet Forum (Stockholm, Sweden); World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) Forum (Geneva, Switzerland); Global Privacy and Data protection conference (Hong Kong, China); Internet Freedom Conference (Vienna, Austria);
- **Regional and national multi-stakeholder events:** Africa Internet Summit (Nairobi, Kenya); European Dialogue on Internet Governance (EuroDIG) (Tallinn, Estonia); Asia Pacific Internet Governance Forum (Bangkok, Thailand); Latin America and the Caribbean Internet Governance Forum (Panama City, Panama); Forum on Internet Freedom in Africa (FIFAfrica) (Johannesburg, South Africa); Jordan Media Institute (Amman, Jordan); Vietnam Internet Forum (Hanoi, Vietnam, upcoming);
- **Global and regional events driven by technical and academic communities:** Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ICANN60 (Abu Dhabi, UAE); Global Internet Governance as a Diplomacy Issue (GIG-ARTS) (Paris, France); British and Irish Law Education and Technology Association (BILETA) (Braga, Portugal); International Association for Media and Communication Research 2017 (IAMCR) (Cartagena, Colombia); Berkman Klein Center for Internet and Society (Cambridge, USA);
- **Media related events:** World News Media Congress (Durban, South Africa); Global Media Forum (Bonn, Germany); European Journalism Training Association (Moscow, Russia);

- **Global events hosted by UNESCO:** World Press Freedom Day (Jakarta, Indonesia); Seventh Media and Information Literacy and Intercultural Dialogue (MILID) Conference (Kingston, Jamaica); International Programme for the Development of Communication Council (IPDC) information meeting (Paris, France).

Different consultation formats were convened during this first phase of events, ranging from presentations, interactive panel discussions, workshops, roundtables and focus groups, each of which was attended by 30-80 participants. In total, we estimate that about 1000 participants were involved and commented on the different dimensions of the indicators.

The participants of these consultation sessions raised interesting concerns and made important remarks related to the five categories of the Indicators, summarized under the acronym ROAM-X:

Rights (R)
Openness (O)
Accessibility (A)
Multistakeholder Participation (M) and
Cross-Cutting Issues (X).

Their interventions included comments on online privacy, data protection, right to information, freedom of expression, open data, open education resources, diversity, quality access, governance, engagement, gender, women, children, migrants, etc.

Participants shared other existing indicators and ongoing endeavors to measure the Internet by different stakeholders. They gave suggestions on how to further raise awareness and conduct advocacy and training. They also shared their ideas on the implementation of the indicators for policy improvement at national levels, including ideas on how to promote the framework of indicators to the Member States and other stakeholders.

Many participants are now part of the “Internet Universality Community” which counts 700 contacts which can be reached during the second phase of the project as well as for the testing and implementation of the indicators.

To take forward these important inputs in the drafting process of indicators, the key comments from those sessions are compiled and synthesized in the five categories of indicators below in the form of a **summary chart of key suggestions and a narrative description including elaborated inputs made.**

A list of the consultation events and related press releases as well as selected pictures are attached in annex.

2. Summary chart including proposed indicators and recommendations made

	Main values to consider and indicators proposed
Rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the rights to privacy and anonymity • privacy and data protection laws applicable to the Internet • the use of encryption amongst citizens • the availability of online services that do not track <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ethics on the Internet • dignity and equality, especially in the case of online hate speech • a right to not be subjected to degradation and threats online • freedom of religious and political expression and the right to assembly and association online <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • freedom of expression • intellectual property of journalists and media • the right to open a news website without having to have a license <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the rights of women and children • the status and fate of refugees, immigrants or minorities • the rights of disabled people • the rights of transgender persons <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the existence of an independent authority to which citizens can have recourse • a right of access to remedy
Openness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent to which States proactively make data available and whether this data is machine-readable • “open data”, “open source”, “open innovation” and “open market” • open governance principles • open and transparent policy and decision making process • the degree of openness for new entrants to Internet-mediated markets <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accountability (e.g., open government, public information) and transparency (e.g., access to government data vs. classified material) • whether algorithms are open for auditing • whether security vulnerabilities known as “zero-day exploits” are hidden or brought to the attention of actors who could fix them <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • online media diversity

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent of open education resources online
Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the cost of Internet access, affordability • access to hardware and tools to use the Internet, bandwidth • digital divide • quality of Internet access <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cultural and linguistic diversity • cultural barriers and right to information • investment in online local content <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media and Information Literacy (MIL), training, education • public access to information • digital participation • Internet censorship, self-censorship online • the free flow of information and ideas online <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • diversity of offers for handicapped persons • government websites available to people with disabilities • Internet access for the elderly <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internet shutdowns • transparency, takedowns of domain names • independence of national registries for website names • content restrictions
Multistakeholder participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collaboration between UNESCO, governments, operators and civil society organizations on the indicators, sharing data and fostering relationships • accountability in Internet governance • the triangle roles of visionary regulators, strategic governments and responsible companies • how pluralistic the Internet is <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strong civil society • community involvement in policy around domain names • difficulty to engage in a multistakeholder process • participation by nationals in global fora such as the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)
Cross-cutting issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gender issues • the safety of women and girls • online abuse of women • refugees and migrants

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• transparency and accountability• the security of both network and users• the inclusion of “humanity” into technology to empower individuals• the risk of Internet fragmentation
General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• take into account future trends so the indicators can be used in the long term• do not repeat work already developed• develop clear indicators for there to be a better implementation• the number of indicators should be workable• test the indicators both in diverse geographies and in different political landscapes

3. Narrative description of the elaborate inputs made for the five categories of indicators

Human Rights

Specific suggestions were made by Joseph Cannataci, UN Special Rapporteur on Privacy and lead author of UNESCO publication *Privacy, Free Expression and Transparency*. Professor Cannataci proposed indicators about whether States encouraged the use of encryption amongst citizens, improving transparency in e-governance and e-democracy and protecting online expression of journalists and social media producers. For private sector, Professor Cannataci recommended indicators to assess if they foster awareness and know-how on privacy protection, take more transparency measures and conduct human rights impact assessments. “International society needs to have more co-operation at the regional and national levels in sharing good practices and preventing cyber-attacks that can violate privacy or paralyze free expression” he said. He also called upon international organizations to foster digital literacy as a life skill within Media and Information Literacy.

In addition to proposals concerning surveillance, transparency and whistleblower protection, the professor also suggested as indicators: “Does the country have privacy and data protection laws which are applicable to the Internet?”; “Does the country have a separate independent authority to which the citizen can have recourse if his or her privacy is infringed?”

Ms Eileen Donahoe, distinguished fellow at the Centre for International Governance Innovation, said the initiative was very welcome. “There is a momentum as big digital platforms are showing will to respect human rights, but at the same time they need some guidance,” she stated.

Mogens Blicher Bjerregard, Member of the Intergovernmental Council at UNESCO's International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC), proposed that the indicators consider the question of intellectual property of journalists and media.

For Gayathry Venkiteswaran, former Executive Director of the Southeast Asian Press Alliance (SEAPA), “the concept of Internet Universality should consider the status and fate of refugees, immigrants or minorities in border areas where people are stateless, marginalized and without any access to civil rights”. She added: “It should also consider other indicators accommodating issues such as cultural barriers and right to information”.

Amongst proposals by other participants were: a right of access to remedy for Internet users who feel their human rights are harmed. Also mentioned were rights to language, as well as a right to not be subjected to degradation and threats online.

Also proposed for indicator development were privacy rights and the rights of disabled people, as well as the right to open a news website without having to have a license.

A number of contributions noted the importance of considering the rights specifically of women and children in relation to the Internet environment, and called for appropriate indicators for measurement.

Other participants suggested consideration of whether there should be a right of access to the Internet, and further attention was pointed to the rights to privacy, dignity and equality, especially in the case of online hate speech. One participant emphasized the issue of enforcement of regulations and agreements already in place, and called for monitoring and implementing obligations.

“Rights entail a number of digital rights including freedom of religious and political expression and right to assembly and association online. Privacy concerns on the Internet are extremely important as well”, stated Ms Gayatri Khandahi from APC on Human Rights indicators. In addition, she noted the importance of social and economic rights exercised on the Internet, such as the right to work and the right to political participation, and the jurisdiction challenges of these rights in the pretext of Internet. She emphasized the need to consult also with vulnerable groups, such as women, trans-gender groups and migrants.

Dr. Anja Kovacs from Internet Democracy Project noted that in the course of developing these indicators, it is crucial to take into account future trends because digital rights are evolving and these indicators might not be useful in 10 years.

In the face of “ubiquitous digital tracking”, the proposed Internet indicators should include attention to national conditions for encryption and anonymity, said Arne Hintz (Cardiff University, UK). Also important, he added, would be an indicator to assess the availability of online services that do not track.

Mira Milosevic, Executive Director of the Global Forum for Media Development said that freedom of expression and content-related issues are especially important to promote the Internet as a platform for democratic discourse.

Stephen Kai-yi Wong, Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data of Hong Kong, and Hannah McCausland, from the Information Commissioner’s Office of the UK, stressed the role of privacy and data protection regulators and said that “regulators should be able to develop projects that enable people to exercise their privacy and data protection rights on the Internet”.

John Edwards from the Office of the Privacy Commissioner (New Zealand) said that he considered online privacy as a “precondition” to gain other rights, including women’s rights.

Mario Oetheimer from the EU Fundamental Rights Agency and Jack Linchuan Qiu, Professor at Hong Kong Chinese University, expressed their concerns regarding human rights as individual and collective rights in the digital age and called for putting this category of indicators at the heart of the project.

Professor Pál Tamás from the Hungarian Academy of Science, expressed concerns about communicative media being used for promoting intolerance and cultivating a blind acceptance of reality, and negative experiences of disintermediation, “fake news”, hate speech, radicalization, polarization, post-factualism and sensationalism on the Internet.

Elena Sherstoboeva from the Higher School of Economics in Moscow suggested the use of sub-indicators such as: whether the legal framework is transparent, whether the laws promote adequate measures for human rights, and how they are implemented.

“It may be interesting to add an indicator related to ethics on the internet, as well as to consider the rights of refugees and the rights of people with disabilities,” said Dr. Abdullah Ababneh, Head of the National Centre for Human Resources Development (Amman, Jordan).

“Will UNESCO consider not just human rights, but also peoples’ rights?” was the question raised by Grace Mutung’u, Open Technology Fund Fellow at the Berkman Klein Center. She also drew attention to the situation where a group of people is denied access to the internet systematically or abruptly, arguing that such situations involved “collective rights”.

Casey Tilton, Project Coordinator at the Berkman Klein Center, stressed the relevance of a sub-indicator set up to track internet shutdowns and their effects on human rights.

Openness

Constance Bommelaer de Leusse, Senior Director, Global Internet policy at the Internet Society (ISOC), said there was a need to measure the technical dimension of openness which underpinned the free flow of information and ideas online.

Suggestions were made about developing indicators to assess the extent of open education resources online, and the degree of openness for new entrants to Internet-mediated markets. Other proposals were for indicators to enable assessment of the extent to which States proactively make data available and whether this data is machine-readable. There was also discussion about whether choice and plurality of services and content were part of Openness, alongside more traditional issues such as technical interoperability. It was further suggested that open governance principles could be part of this set of indicators.

Questions were raised as to whether Openness should include assessment about whether algorithms are open for auditing, and whether security vulnerabilities known as “zero-day exploits” are hidden or brought to the attention of actors who could fix them.

“It’s a real challenge to come up with indicators that are straightforward and give a clear picture of the level of openness of the Internet in a given country” pointed out Chris Buckridge, External Relations Manager for the Réseaux IP Européens Network Coordination Centre (RIPE NCC). He emphasized the importance of technical data, and suggested that UNESCO, governments, operators and civil society organizations will need to collaborate actively on the indicators, sharing data and fostering relationships.

On Openness indicators, “media diversity” online was recommended by several actors as important to assess.

How Openness is impacted by artificial intelligence within the landscape of transparency, open data and Internet of Things, was also signaled. Many stakeholders mentioned the importance to measure accountability (e.g., open government, public information) and transparency (e.g., access to government data vs. classified material). Other potential indicators were recommended, such as measuring whether or not a society has an institution that can ensure implementation of public information laws.

“Open Internet is a top concern since it is being limited by many localized requirements. Thus openness requires open and transparent policy and decision making process which is at the core of multi-stakeholder approach”, commented by Prof. Xue Hong from Beijing Normal University on Openness indicators. She suggested “open access” needs to consider people’s various barriers to access Internet, including legal barriers. She suggested that “open source”, “open innovation” and “open market” are also important aspects to measure the level of openness.

Participants suggested that Internet Universality indicators could assess transparency around takedowns of domain names, as well as the extent of abuse where websites were used for phishing, spam and botnet.

Further issues discussed included open standards, open source, open access, open data, and open markets.

Accessibility

Commenting on measuring the accessibility of the Internet, Mr. Dhanaraj Thakur, Senior Research Manager, Alliance for Affordable Internet, said that the cost of internet access in terms of data per month should be an important element measured by the indicators. He also underlined the importance for the data of the project to be published on an open-basis to be interrogated afterwards and be linked to advocacy causes. “There is also a need to track the diverse uses of the internet and provide gender separated data,” he stated.

Ms Gayatri Khandhadai (Project Coordinator at IMPACT, APC) called for consideration of local cultures when developing the indicators as “there are cultural issues in the expansion of internet access; yet, peripheral cultures can still exist and express themselves vis-a-vis the dominant culture through the Internet”.

Stephen Wyber (International Federation of Library Associations - IFLA) spoke about accessibility indicators. Mr. Wyber referred to initiatives by IFLA and others to put together useful statistics and global data on public access to the Internet and information. He emphasized the importance of understanding what people are actually looking for and how they are using the Internet before developing the indicators.

Participants pointed to the importance of media literacy, digital participation, access to hardware, and tools to use the Internet, as well as assessment of affordability. In addition, linguistic diversity and the diversity of offers for handicapped persons were mentioned as important indicators of accessibility.

The issue of investment in online local content was taken up further by Jeremy Shterns (Ryerson University, Canada). He signaled a new trend in sponsored entertainment content online, produced by local people in local languages. This suggested that there could be an indicator linked to local content and cultural diversity, he said.

Mr. Winston Roberts from the International Federation of Library Associations & Institutions (IFLA) suggested that the definition of universal access needs to be updated and access in various forms can be used as an indicator, such as access to broadband. He stressed the importance to include quality access and access in rural areas.

“Access and accessibility should be defined clearly. Access should include indicators to assess quality of service and openness should include assessment of the market”, stated Ms. Bishakha Datta of Point of View, a non-profit working on issues of gender, sexuality and women’s rights. Mr. Naveed Haq from Internet Society suggested those accessibility indicators could check how many government websites are available to people with disabilities.

Dr. Angus W.H. Cheong, Founder and CEO of ERS e-Research & Solutions, emphasized the idea that the accessibility dimension of the indicators (measured by indicators on gender, occupation and age) was key to reduce the digital divide.

Stephen Kai-yi Wong also pointed out that the elderly should not be forgotten in this category of

indicators.

Elena Vartanova, Dean of the Faculty of Journalism at Lomonosov Moscow State University, said that the “Internet should be understood as something broader than access to social media”. She added that “a majority of countries are still facing the digital divide and access to the Internet should possibly be seen as a human right”.

Tatyana Murovana representing the UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (UNESCO IITE) said that “Modern Internet technologies should be used to prevent Internet from compromising social relations by supporting preservation of language diversity, ensure digital vitality of languages and equal possibilities and assess the rare mobility”. She stressed “Media and Information Literacy for the well-being and progress of the individual, the community, the economy and civil society” as an integral component for accessibility indicators.

Dr. Baha’ Khasawnah, Director General of National Information Technology Center, noted that bridging the digital divide, improving digital literacy, and empowerment of women and youth are key issues in internet accessibility in Jordan. “Assessing digital literacy could be measured by assessing the number of people that have been trained, measuring the amount of bandwidth in schools, resources that have been accessed, number of downloads, uploads and how many new subscribers are joining. As for the digital divide, measuring the success is difficult. In our experience, we have measured the numbers we have trained and how many people have returned for training,” he added.

Further indicators could assess national registries for website names, as to whether they were independent and operated language policies, and whether the country allowed for competitive services for sub-domain name registration.

Referring to the technology under which Internet addresses are allocated, several participants said it was relevant to assess to what extent IP Version 6 is being used in a country as this would provide an idea about how advanced local internet networks were.

Information on the routing of Internet traffic is important for the Indicators because it impacts on affordability and therefore accessibility, said one participant

Nikki Bourassa, Berkman Klein Center for Internet & Society at Harvard University, challenged “the baseline for what we’re calling the Internet”, stating that accessing the Internet could be very different through a web browser or an app.

Jonathan Donner, Senior Director of Research at Caribou Digital, underlined that “many parts of the world typically have low bandwidth experiences, which begins to challenge what we think the Internet and Internet access is, so we should measure an internet that is fragmenting not just across countries but also within countries”.

Helmi Noman, Research Affiliate at the Berkman Klein Center, said that “We should examine Internet censorship and must not ignore the complex issue of self-censorship, which defies the theoretical idea of what accessibility is”. He shared the Berkman Center’s project to build test the

accessibility of a range of websites in a given country, as well as the transparency issue related to content restrictions.

Mariel Garcia suggested the “argument gap between Internet access and open data” and called for an indicator that would measure the “right to access public information”.

Further concerns by the experts included how open markets could be structured so as to really benefit developing countries; and examining the national Internet Service Provision market in terms of the independence of providers.

Multistakeholder participation

Xingdong Fang (CEO of Cyberlabs) emphasized the idea of taking a pragmatic and empirical approach when developing the indicators. He added that this approach would help measure participation based on a good understanding of what the users do and need on the Internet, particularly in those under-developed regions where billions of people will get access to the Internet in the near future.

On this category of indicators, experts noted the importance of identifying and holding different stakeholders accountable in Internet governance. It was recommended to evaluate the role of private sector actors and whether transnational companies are dominant. It was proposed that “strong civil society” is a good indicator in this category. Some experts called attention to assessing when engagement in a multistakeholder process is genuine.

“Internet is a classic example where various communities are represented and thus multistakeholderism becomes important”, said Mr. Naveed Haq from the Internet Society.

Mr. Sunil Abraham from Center for Internet Society raised challenges that the government needs to deregulate policies and laws and redo them with a multi-stakeholder process, and the extent to which private sector actors fail to mitigate harm through the self-regulatory model.

Mr. Joyce Chen, ICANN representative, highlighted the importance to engage with governments, who also need to facilitate more dialogue.

Bojana Bellamy from the Centre for Information Policy and Leadership highlighted the triangle roles of visionary regulators, strategic governments and responsible companies which serve as a foundation of any Internet regulation.

Nadezhda Azhgikhina from the Lomonosov Moscow State University stressed the gender issues that women journalists and bloggers face more and more threats online and that these issues could only be solved by a multistakeholder approach and the active participation of government, scholars and businesses.

An indicator was suggested to assess if there is community involvement in policy around domain names, and a further proposed indicator was about participation by nationals in global fora such as the Internet Governance Forum (IGF).

Cross-cutting issues

Cross-cutting issues were also debated, such as whether there should be mainstreaming or specializing of indicators to take account of gender issues, and age differences such as apply to children and youth.

Andrea Calderaro (Cardiff University) commented: “This [project] is a great opportunity to go beyond the classical way of thinking about Internet.” He then insisted on the fact that in developing these indicators, UNESCO will have to focus on the quality of Internet access and find a way to measure how pluralistic the Internet is.

Some participants called for transparency and accountability to be treated as cross-cutting indicators. In addition, it was recommended to identify indicators to measure the inclusion of “humanity” into technology to empower individuals.

Dr. Anja Kovacs from the Internet Democracy Project pointed out that rights have impact on other themes or indicators, for instance online abuse of women impacts access in India. She added that it is crucial not miss out groups of people whose interests might not be directly aligned with their governments, for instance refugees or migrants.

“The rights and interests of those vulnerable groups, such as transgender people and women should be considered by the indicators, particularly to assess how rights, such as the right to privacy intersect with their agenda”, suggested Bishakha Datta from Point of View.

Claudia Padovani (Padova University, Italy) proposed that gender be mainstreamed through the indicators and not reduced to the principle of accessibility. It was not enough to look at the inclusion of women in Internet issues, she said, but rather at transformation as covered in UNESCO’s Gender Sensitive Indicators for Media.

Jan Kleijssen from the Council of Europe suggested to include the security of both network and users and the safety of women and girls as crosscutting issues for the indicators and added that the risk of Internet fragmentation needed to be considered by the indicators.

Jenn Halen, fellow at the Berkman Klein Center, pointed out the linkage between self-censorship to the extreme harassment women experience online.

General comments

In the face-to-face consultations, participants also discussed the ultimate use of indicators, and signaled their value as a tool for tracking policy outcomes over time, raising awareness, training and advocacy. Additional uses pointed out included the value of the indicators for researchers, media and national human rights commissions.

Experts recommended to look at existing international reports and not repeat work already developed (including UNESCO's Journalists' Safety Indicators, Media Development Indicators, the Internet freedom indicators by the Council of Europe).

"It is very important to develop clear indicators for there to be a better implementation", advised Karmen Turk (Triniti Law Firm, University of Tartu) when she shared the good practice of developing Internet freedom indicators by the Council of Europe.

The Internet Universality ROAM framework is "a very positive instrument in policy design for the SDGs where some aspects can be measured quantitatively, but others will require qualitative methodologies," said Alexandre Barbosa from CETIC.BR. He stressed that it is important to encourage the promotion of research into law and regulation.

Various speakers praised the ROAM principles and stressed that the linkages between them will help achieve a transparent and inclusive Internet.

Speakers also debated about the future of the Internet and the transition from Information Society to Knowledge Society.

Robin Mansell (London School of Economics and Political Science, UK), said that the proposed indicators could be used for "emancipatory" rather than "catch-up" purposes. Her point was taken further by Binod Agrawal (MICA, India), who emphasized that "Internet universality" should not lead to cultural and linguistic domination via the Internet.

Gabriel Kaplun (Universidad de la Republica, Ecuador) said that indicators were about "what we decide for the future", and that research using them for country assessments needed to be reliable and legitimate. Based on his experience in Uruguay of using UNESCO's Media Development Indicators, Kaplun signaled the need for an expert and co-ordinated research team to tackle problems of complexity, as well as the difficulty of the research being overtaken by legislative developments.

"The indicators should be used to promote progressive development rather than for ranking the states. The indicators should also be future-oriented and address the forthcoming challenges of big data, artificial intelligence, etc.", stated Jan Kleijssen from the Council of Europe.

"Indicators should follow a risk-based approach to identify problems and challenges so as to facilitate constructive policy improvements," suggested Dr Kate Coyer. She recommended that the number of indicators should be workable and embrace both high-level questions and some precise ones that could be specifically tested. She reminded that it is essential to test the indicators

both in diverse geographies and in different political landscapes.

Annex 1: A list of Face-to-Face Consultation Events

Events	Dates	Location	News release
RightsCon Brussels	29-31 March 2017	Brussels, Belgium	UNESCO consults experts on Internet Universality Indicators at Brussels conference
GIG-ARTS Paris	30-31 March 2017	Paris, France	UNESCO consults Gig-ARTS Conference on its new project Defining Internet Universality Indicators
BILETA (British and Irish Law Education and Technology Association)	10-11 April 2017	Braga, Portugal	UNESCO advocates Internet Universality indicators and online freedoms at BILETA conference
World Press Freedom Day	1-4 May 2017	Jakarta, Indonesia	UNESCO consults on developing Internet Universality Indicators during World Press Freedom Day
Stockholm Internet Forum	22 May 2017	Stockholm, Sweden	UNESCO consults on Internet Universality indicators
Africa Internet Summit	30 May 2017	Nairobi, Kenya	*
European Dialogue on Internet Governance (EuroDIG)	6-7 June 2017	Tallinn, Estonia	UNESCO holds a multistakeholder consultation on Internet Universality Indicators at EuroDIG conference
World News Media Congress	7-9 June 2017	Durban, South Africa	*
WSIS Forum	12-16 June 2017	Geneva, Switzerland	UNESCO launches consultation website to define Internet Universality Indicators during WSIS Forum 2017
Global Media Forum	19-21 June 2017	Bonn, Germany	Internet Universality indicators consulted at the Deutsche Welle Global Media Forum 2017
IAMCR 2017	16-20 July 2017	Cartagena, Columbia	UNESCO consults academics on Internet indicators
Asia Pacific IGF	26-29 July 2017	Bangkok, Thailand	UNESCO Internet Universality Indicators consulted at the 8th Asia Pacific Regional Internet Governance Forum
IGF LAC	2-4 August 2017	Panama City, Panama	*
APC member meeting	16-18 August 2017	Johannesburg, South Africa	*
Forum on Internet Freedom in Africa (FIFAfrica)	27-29 September 2017	Johannesburg, South Africa	*
IPDC Council information meeting	28 September 2017	Paris, France	UNESCO Member States encouraged to participate in the framing of Internet

			Universality indicators during IPDC meeting
Global Privacy and Data protection conference	28-29 September 2017	Hong Kong, China	UNESCO Internet Universality Indicators consulted at 39th International Conference of Data Protection and Privacy Commissioners in Hong Kong
Internet Freedom conference	13 October 2017	Vienna, Austria	UNESCO advocates Internet Universality and international human rights standards at the Internet Freedom Conference in Vienna
Moscow: European Journalism Training Association	18-20 October 2017	Moscow, Russia	Russian journalism community and academia engage in UNESCO's project to develop Internet Universality indicators
Berkman Klein Center for Internet and Society	23-24 October 2017	Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA	UNESCO Internet Universality Indicators consulted at Berkman Klein Center for Internet & Society at Harvard University
Jordan Media Institute	24 October 2017	Amman, Jordan	UNESCO Internet Universality Indicators consultations organized in Amman
Seventh Media and Information Literacy and Intercultural Dialogue (MILID) Conference	25 October - 1 November 2017	Kingston, Jamaica	*
ICANN60	28 October - 3 November 2017	Abu Dhabi, UAE	UNESCO consults on Internet indicators at ICANN60
Vietnam Internet Forum	27-28 November 2017	Hanoi, Vietnam	*

Annex 2: Pictures of selected consultation sessions



World Press Freedom Day in Jakarta, Indonesia (1-4 May 2017)



WSIS Forum in Geneva, Switzerland (12-16 June 2017)



International Conference of Data Protection and Privacy Commissioners in Hong Kong, China (28-29 September 2017)



Conference of the European Journalism Training Association in Moscow, Russia (18-20 October 2017)