

Submission # 30

Name:Viktors Kravčenko

Organization:Ministry of Education and Science

Country/Region:Republic of Latvia

How would you define the stakeholder community or communities to which you belong?

Government

Are there any suggestions that you wish to make in respect of the proposed themes, questions and indicators which are included in the framework as it stands?

Thank you very much for this opportunity to comment the Internet Universality Indicators' framework. The framework seems very well elaborated and covers a broad scope of relevant themes, questions and indicators.

If I may propose any additional question to this framework, it will be a question what countries have done to promote severely and critically endangered languages (if on their territories) on the Internet. This issue can be included in category A – Accessibility to All, theme E – Local Content and Language is appropriate place. A third indicator could be added under the question E.3 “Are services available which enable citizens to access and use local scripts and languages online?”, namely: Availability of Internet domains and websites in severely and critically endangered languages. Alternatively, the question about internet content of and public support to severely and critically endangered languages can be added as a new E.5 question at the end of the theme.

Are there any suggestions that you wish to make in respect of the proposed themes, questions and indicators which are included in the framework as it stands?

As for any specific comments, i wrote them on the draft indicators document on the interactive platform. These comments were on questions A.5 and F.1 (both category A - Accessibility), and on Crosscutting indicator D.3.

What sources and means of verification would you recommend, from your experience, in relation to any of the questions and indicators that have been proposed?

This is probably most difficult question. Countries' monitoring frameworks are very different. This is an enormous work, similar to that of SDGs to find out reliable and comparable sources of verification. The first step would be to make an inventory of existing national and international monitoring frameworks in regard to Internet Universality Indicators. It is of course good to read about the ambitious “final phase of preparing of the report”, what will include the validation of the proposed indicators, including the assessment of the viability of collecting and analysing data and

evidence in diverse national contexts. Thank you for your great work!