

Submission # 47

Name:Eric Mousset

Country/Region:Cambodia

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

Internet technical and professional community

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?

INDICATOR FRAMEWORK

One of the six criteria proposed on Page 3 aims at establishing questions and indicators that “should, where possible and relevant, permit disaggregation by gender, age group and other population characteristics”.

Achieving such degree of disaggregation might be difficult to reconcile with Category R, Theme E that is concerned with issues relating to privacy.

CONTEXTUAL INDICATORS

ICT development indicators

ICT Development Index

The ICT Development Index prepared by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) is itself an

aggregation of a wide range of indicators, most of which are directly relevant to UNESCO’s initiative, namely:

- ICT infrastructure and access indicators — (i) Fixed-telephone subscriptions per 100 inhabitants; (ii) Mobile-cellular telephone subscriptions per 100 inhabitants; (iii) International Internet bandwidth (bit/s) per Internet user; (iv) Percentage of households with a computer;
- ICT usage indicators — (i) Percentage of individuals using the Internet; (ii) Fixed-broadband subscriptions per 100 inhabitants; (iii) Active mobile-broadband subscriptions per 100 inhabitants; (iv)
- ICT skills indicators — (i) Mean years of schooling; (ii) Gross enrolment ratio (secondary and tertiary level).

è Recommendation — It would be worthwhile considering ITU’s ICT Development Index in its disaggregated form, i.e. considering its own indicators separately from one another.

World Economic Forum Networked Readiness Index

A similar remark applies as for ITU’s ICT Development Index. The World Economic Forum Networked

Readiness Index is a single score whose computation is based on successive aggregations of scores, namely:

- Environment subindex — (i) Political and regulatory environment (9 indicators); (ii) Business and innovation environment (9 indicators);
- Readiness subindex — (i) Infrastructure (4 indicators); (ii) Affordability (3 indicators); (iii) Skills (4 indicators);
- Usage subindex — (i) Individual usage (7 indicators); (ii) Business usage (6 indicators); (iii) Government usage (3 indicators)
- Impact subindex — (i) Economic impacts (4 indicators); (ii) Social impacts (4 indicators).

è Recommendation — It would be worthwhile considering World Economic Forum Networked Readiness

Index in its disaggregated form, i.e. considering its own subindexes or even indicators separately from one another.

è Recommendation — It would be worthwhile singling out overlapping indicators across both indexes

(ITU's ICT Development Index and The World Economic Forum Networked Readiness Index). This would give

the opportunity to conduct comparative analyses (convergence/divergence) and thereby enrich the information taken into consideration in UNESCO's own framework for Internet universality. Areas of overlap

seem to include:

- Infrastructure;
- Skills;
- Usage.

Page 4 of 7

CATEGORY R – RIGHTS

THEME A – POLICY, LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

I would suggest reordering questions from least confronting to most confronting — for example placing

question A.4 on training first instead of last. That remark probably reflects my long-term residence in a

country where the dominant culture is non-confrontational —namely Cambodia— and it applies to all

sections of the framework.

I suggest adding a question regarding consultation, which would allow efforts being made by the Cambodian

Government on that front to be acknowledged. A tentative formulation follows.

A.5 Does the Government invite open consultation while expanding or amending the legal/regulatory framework related to the Internet or access to information?

Indicator:

- Percentage of lawmaking processes related to the Internet or access to information having invited open consultation (over the period under scope).

Alternatively, that question could be placed under THEME D – FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION AND THE RIGHT

TO PARTICIPATE IN PUBLIC LIFE.

Page 5 of 7

CATEGORY O – OPENNESS

THEME B – OPEN STANDARDS

First indicator under Question B.1 “Evidence concerning government policy and practice towards online

innovation, including procurement” clearly addresses an essential aspect of competitiveness that is innovation, and a second aspects that is procurement. Both aspects directly relate to market conditions. The

indicator in focus would be better placed under [O – OPENNESS] THEME C – OPEN MARKETS.

Second indicator under Question B.1 “Number and survival rate of Internet-related start-ups” clearly address

economic development, and therefore would be better placed under [CROSS-CUTTING

INDICATORS] GROUP

C – SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.

Question B.3 emphasizes the importance of FOSS over other kinds of open licenses such as Creative

Commons and its diverse range of openness options. It might be worthwhile reformulating it as follows:

B.3 Does the government promote the diversity of intellectual property licensing options including free and open-source software (FOSS)?

Indicators:

- Government policy towards free and open-source software (FOSS), including Creative Commons and other licensing options promoting free reuse.
- Extent to which FOSS is used in government departments (including software under Creative Commons and other licensing options promoting free reuse).
- Extent to the government promotes an awareness of the diversity of intellectual property licensing options within the software developer community (policy notes, training seminars, etc.).

Such new formulation introduces some degree of redundancy with Question D.2 It may be worthwhile

merging questions B.3 and D.2 under a single list of related indicators.

THEME D – OPEN CONTENT

It would be worthwhile adding a third indicator to Question D.4 that would measure progress with the

development of digital information repositories (DIRs) a.k.a. “e-libraries”. Tentative formulation follows:

D.4 Does the government encourage the use of open educational resources (OER) and facilitate open access to academic resources?

Indicators:

- Educational policy framework concerning OER.
- Arrangements for access to academic and scientific resources by higher education institutions and students.
- Number of new Digital Information Repositories created and registered with international registries such as OpenDOAR (<http://www.opendoar.org/>) or ROAR (<http://roar.eprints.org/>).

See in particular the web page under OpenDOAR that offers a direct comparison of the number of DIRs

across regions or countries: <http://www.opendoar.org/find.php>

Page 6 of 7

CATEGORY A – ACCESSIBILITY TO ALL

THEME B – CONNECTIVITY AND USAGE

A fair range of questions under this theme may be answered thanks to information already available from

ITU's ICT Development Index and the World Economic Forum Networked Readiness Index. See remarks

above on Page 3.

THEME C – AFFORDABILITY

ditto

THEME D – EQUITABLE ACCESS

ditto

THEME F – CAPABILITIES / COMPETENCIES

ditto

Page 7 of 7

CROSS-CUTTING INDICATORS

GROUP B – CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

Question B.5 enquires about the situation in primary and secondary schools. However, there is no question

enquiring about the situation in universities — while the etymology of “university” is obviously common to

“universal”.

It is suggested to mirror question B.5 in an additional question focusing on higher education institutions

(HEIs), which could be formulated as follows:

B.7 Do higher education institutions (HIRs) have Internet and broadband access??

Indicators:

- Proportions of HIRs with broadband and Internet access, disaggregated by tier (private/public) and location (rural/urban)
- Learner to computer ratio in HIRs, disaggregated as above