

CATEGORY M – MULTISTAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

Like the Rights Category, it would be good to reference the various international agreements where multistakeholder approaches to internet governance and policy making were endorsed (i.e. WSIS outcomes, NETmundial, etc)

Suggest replacing “participation” with “approaches to internet governance”. Participation implies a more limited exercise, one participates and the participation may be influential or it may not be. Approaches to governance mean that the process by which decisions are made integrate the contributions of various stakeholder groups.

THEME A – LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK		
<p>I see this as more relating to Article 25 of the ICCPR than to multistakeholder approaches to internet governance. Consider moving there.</p> <p>Are there any <i>additional themes, questions or indicators</i> which you believe should be included in the framework?</p>		
	<p>Are there any suggestions that you wish to make in respect of the <i>proposed themes, questions and indicators</i> which are included in the framework as it stands?</p>	<p>What <i>sources and means of verification</i> would you recommend, from your experience, in relation to any of the questions and indicators that have been proposed?</p>
<p>A.1 Does the government encourage participation by other stakeholders in national governance through the Internet? (This concerns processes which are not themselves about the Internet.) Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value and ranking in UN DESA E-Participation Index • Legal arrangement requiring public consultation and legal and practical arrangements for online consultation processes • Number and range of government consultation processes and opportunities available online • Evidence of participation by diverse stakeholder groups in online consultation processes 	<p>Add to the 4th bullet, diversity of participants in consultative processes, including on the basis of age, gender, race, ethnicity, geography, religion, etc.</p> <p>Add indicator on proactive efforts by the government to reach diverse participation in consultations.</p>	<p>Disaggregated data on participants.</p> <p>Data on number of citizens/residents reached, through different mediums.</p>
<p>A.2 Is government accountable to citizens and stakeholder communities? Indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constitutional and institutional arrangements for government accountability, and evidence from credible sources that these are implemented in practice 	<p>Add: those who are impacted by a policy are able to understand it, how it was developed, how it will be implemented, and how they can raise complaints or questions.</p> <p>Add: government periodically reports on progress implementing policies.</p>	
THEME B – NATIONAL INTERNET GOVERNANCE		

This theme is concerned with the extent to which diverse stakeholder groups are involved in national-level policymaking concerned with the Internet.

Are there any *additional themes, questions or indicators* which you believe should be included in the framework?

Is national-level internet-related policy making transparent and accessible to all who are interested to participate?

Does the government make efforts to include people or groups who are excluded or marginalised (for example on the basis of language, disability, geography, etc.)

<p>B.1 Are there active associations of Internet professionals, consumers and other stakeholder communities? Indicator: • Existence, membership data (aggregate and disaggregated) and level of activity of relevant associations</p>	<p>I don't understand how this is an indicator of the extent to which diverse stakeholder groups are involved in national-level policy making. Of course they need to exist in order to be involved, but their existence would indicate maturity of internet ecosystem, respect for civic space, or enabling environment for industry. In my view the indicator presupposes that there is an active community of internet stakeholders.</p>	
<p>B.2 Does the government actively involve other stakeholder groups in developing national Internet policies and legislation? Indicators: • Existence of arrangements for multistakeholder consultation and involvement in national policymaking institutions and processes concerned with the evolution and use of the Internet • Numbers of non-governmental stakeholders actively participating, by stakeholder group, disaggregated by gender</p>	<p>Can this be more specific to say that arrangements are transparent, inclusive and accountable? Indicators should also include whether the government makes efforts to facilitate meaningful participation, by for example, providing documents under discussion in advance, using online platforms to get input, providing advance notice for consultations, etc. Also whether the terms and modalities for participation are clear from the outset.</p>	
<p>B.3 Is there a national Internet Governance Forum which is open to all stakeholders, with active participation from diverse stakeholder groups? Indicators: • Existence of national IGF • Participation data, aggregate and disaggregated, with particular attention to participation by selected groups (e.g. education ministries, SMEs, NGOs concerned with children, trades</p>	<p>Suggest changing this to national multistakeholder internet governance initiatives or processes. Not all countries will call their convening an IGF, but they serve the same purpose. Suggest using a word other than "selected" such as under-represented groups. Also suggest engaging with youth directly, not just NGOs concerned with children. Is the planning for the national IG initiative bottom up and includes all</p>	

<p>unions); and including arrangements for remote participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment of national IGF reports filed with global IGF Secretariat 	<p>interested stakeholders in developing the agenda and formats?</p> <p>I think a more important indicator than assessment by the IGF secretariat of reports is the extent to which discussions, outcomes, priorities of national multistakeholder IG convenings are reflected in internet related policies and regulations.</p>	
<p>B.4 Does the national domain name registry involve all stakeholders in its decision-making processes?</p> <p>Indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constitution and practice of domain name registry 	<p>Unclear why this specific policy is singled out, as opposed to national cybersecurity strategy or spectrum allocation.</p>	
<p>THEME C – INTERNATIONAL INTERNET GOVERNANCE</p> <p>This theme is concerned with the extent to which diverse stakeholder groups within the country participate in international fora concerned with Internet governance.</p> <p>Wondering what the rationale is for limiting this to “groups within the country”. Shouldn’t international IG fora be accessible to all internet stakeholders?</p> <p>Are there any <i>additional themes, questions or indicators</i> which you believe should be included in the framework?</p> <p>Unclear why this theme is limited to ICANN, the IGF, and the ITU. There are other relevant internet fora that deal with internet governance (such as trade negotiations and cybersecurity fora) that are in need of multistakeholder participation.</p> <p>Does the government have a national process that it solicits feedback from and reports back to other stakeholders about international IG fora. I’m thinking of the US ITAC process, and I think there’s a similar, though perhaps more formal one in the UK.</p>		
<p>C.1 Does the government actively involve other stakeholder groups in developing policy towards international Internet governance?</p> <p>Indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that government encourages and facilitates multistakeholder preparation for international meetings 	<p>Evidence can be concretised by number of non-governmental stakeholders who participate in preparation for international IG processes, disaggregated by SH group and gender.</p>	
<p>C.2 Do government and other stakeholders from the country actively participate in major international fora concerned with ICTs and the Internet?</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of participants from different stakeholder groups participating in global and regional IGFs, per million population, 	<p>Indicators should also be disaggregated on the basis of region and language.</p> <p>Indicator should be clear that the IGF is not just an event but a process, so participation in intersessional activities</p>	

<p>aggregated and disaggregated by stakeholder group and gender</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation or otherwise of non-government stakeholders in official delegations to ITU, aggregated and disaggregated by stakeholder group and gender 	<p>should be noted as well.</p> <p>If the indicator below addresses government participation in GAC, shouldn't this indicator look at government participation in the IGF, if the idea is to see how governments are participating in international IG fora on a multistakeholder basis?</p> <p>Unclear what "otherwise" means here.</p>	
<p>C.3 Does the government and do other stakeholders participate actively in ICANN? Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership of and active participation in ICANN's Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) • Membership of and active participation in ICANN constituencies, working groups and other fora. 		