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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you define the stakeholder community or communities to which you belong?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☑️ Government  
| ☑️ Intergovernmental organization  
| ✗ Internet technical and professional community  
| ☐ Private sector  
| ☐ Civil society  
| ☐ Academic  
| ☐ Journalism/media  
| ☐ Individual capacity  
| ☐ Other (please specify): |

## Questions

**What are your priorities for issues that should be addressed through the Internet Universality framework in each of these five categories?**

| Rights | - The issue of Internet shutdowns and how politically-motivated disconnections of access affect trust on the Internet and development opportunities.  
|        | - Privacy: users need to be able to trust service providers with their confidential information. This is becoming more important as more connected devices and objects get online in upcoming years, possibly exposing more personal data and activities than before.  
|        | - Women’s rights: empowering girls and women to have equal opportunities to access to and lead in the digital |
society is a key priority. In particular, the Internet can be a game changer in achieving the Sustainable Development Goal 5 for Gender Equality.

| Openness  | - Opportunities brought by the Internet are built upon open and interoperable technical standards. The Internet Society is the administrative umbrella of the Internet Engineering Task Force, that develops such protocols at the Internet layer. Other open standards that are key to keep the Internet as one global network are regrouped under the OpenStand Initiative (openstand.org). Such open standards are key to maintain the Internet as an unfragmented, global network that connects people across borders. |
| Accessibility | - Nearly half of the World’s population does not have affordable access to or access to connectivity. There are proven ways to provide connectivity, train people, and encourage strong and sustainable governance models. We work with partners to do that. We focus on ways and means to build Internet infrastructure, train people, and to build communities to support, govern, and sustain access to Internet infrastructure. We also provide grants to help promote various aspects of “access” (e.g., SDGs, gender, IXPs, community networks, innovative youth programmes). Some of examples of our activities include:  
  - Work with communities to develop and sustain community networks - citizen built, managed, and governed infrastructure that compliments and fills gaps where people do not have access. We bring experts together at the local, regional and global level to build trust and expand human, technical, and development networks.  
  - Administration of grant programmes - our Beyond the Net grant to fund key start-up projects, and to help projects shift into more sophisticated development modes.  
  - Development of policy papers and studies on key issues like spectrum approaches for community networks, SIDS, and LLDCs studies and ways and means to remove barriers to connectivity. We know that current policies and regulations need to change in order to reach the next billion. |
| Multistakeholder participation | - The multistakeholder model for Internet governance is threatened by rapidly changing global forces, including challenges and pressures related to cybersecurity and cybercrime. It is imperative, now more than ever, to talk about this cooperative model and generate momentum |
around its practical value in addressing today’s critical issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-cutting indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Are there any existing indicators with which you are familiar that you think it would be useful to include in the ROAM indicators framework?

### Rights
- Open Observatory of Network Interference-OONI: https://ooni.torproject.org
- Internet Monitor (Harvard): https://thenetmonitor.org
- UN UPR process (Human Rights Council): may include Internet rights-related assessments
- OECD: country reviews may include privacy-related performance
- ITU Equals: Gender Digital Inclusion Map - [https://www.itu.int/en/action/gender-equality/Pages/equalsGDImap.aspx](https://www.itu.int/en/action/gender-equality/Pages/equalsGDImap.aspx)

### Openness

### Accessibility

### Multistakeholder participation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think are the most important gaps in data/evidence required for monitoring Internet Universality and the ROAM principles? What approaches do you think could help to address these in your country, region or area of work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Rights** | - Effective monitoring will require that legitimate and independent entities step up to apply the UNESCO framework to concrete cases.  
- Independent data collection agencies supported either by governments or UN agencies could help identify existing indicators and gaps.  
- Data on multistakeholder participation remains hard to find. A commonly agreed methodology with specific criteria will help in having consistent and comparable data across countries.  
- Privacy and data breaches are not systematically recorded. In fact, there is stigma associated with reporting data breaches or malware attacks particularly with private companies. There is a need for more transparency.  
- There is limited availability of evidence-based and independent rigorous data on access and gender. It needs to be increased on the supply and demand sides, including at the early stages of adoption. |
| African: | - Privacy laws are lacking in Africa: just a handful of countries have Privacy laws (14 out of 54) which sets an important benchmark on measuring progress. |
| **Openness** | There is a lack of good indicators to assess levels of openness. A first challenge is the definition of openness itself, which can be understood in many different ways. Breaking down the concept in measurable indicators would be useful. |
| **Accessibility** | Africa: Statistical agencies in Africa do not collect Internet indicators outside access and internet penetration rates. |
| **Multistakeholder participation** | Common agreement on what multistakeholder participation means in practical terms is key to develop further measurement indicators. |
| Cross-cutting indicators | Supporting statistical agencies at the global and local level with tools and resources to be able to collect Internet Universality indicators |

**What experience or views do you have of indicators relating to the Internet which are concerned with gender and with children and young people?**

Please mention any indicators you consider useful here and provide references.

- Save the Children work on Online and Internet Safety for children.
- UNICEF Children’s right and the Internet which focuses on the transmission of child online sexual abuse images, inappropriate content, online bullying and other forms of harmful behavior, and violation of privacy
- ITU Equals: Gender Digital Inclusion Map - [https://www.itu.int/en/action/gender-equality/Pages/equalsGDImap.aspx](https://www.itu.int/en/action/gender-equality/Pages/equalsGDImap.aspx)

**How do you think you might use the indicator framework for Internet Universality once it has been developed?**
We hope a respected entity (e.g. academic) will pick up the framework and apply it across a large number of government cases, on an annual basis. Being able to compare performance between countries and over the years is one of the most effective advocacy/data tools one could use to approach governments towards better Internet policies. We could use such results in a wide range of domains covered by the Universality framework, such as open standards, access, multistakeholder policy processes, rights and trust (security & privacy). The framework could also be a good complement to measuring SDGs implementation and achievement.

**How do you hope that other stakeholders might use the framework?**

In a similar way. The value of the framework is that it covers a diverse range of issues, incl. technical, rights-based, political. Different stakeholders with different focus areas and expertise could target their advocacy efforts on specific Universality indicators, while highlighting the interconnected nature of the four pillars. A holistic approach is necessary for effective Internet policies (e.g. security can't be addressed without considering rights, technical aspects, economic effects, etc).

**Please add any other comments that you think will be helpful to UNESCO in developing the indicators framework.**

We look forward to seeing the next steps in the process towards concrete implementation of the indicators to real-life cases.