

1. What are the most important **achievements** arising from WSIS that should be highlighted in the Zero Draft? \*

- Twenty years ago, work across stakeholder groups was rare. While we still have siloes, they are not as rigid and impervious as they once were. Multistakeholder work is being done in multiple venues and various types of stakeholder are getting to know each other and are learning to work together.
- While certainly not happening as quickly as desired, nor on the original schedule, progress is being made on the SDGs. This is due in part to the persistent effort that is seen from many of the action line efforts. Without the push from WSIS, or some other setups, to encourage, engage, and needle, fewer of the SDGs would see progress.
- WSIS gives member states a framework they feel they can work within.
- Some gaps are closing while others get worse. WSIS is succeeding with the ones that are closing somewhat, but needs to figure out how to help those that are lagging or worsening.

2. What are the most important **challenges** to the achievement of WSIS outcomes to date and in the future that need to be addressed in the Zero Draft? \*

- There is a large difference between initiating efforts, as written in the Tunis Agenda, and controlling them. UN structures tend to be too top down and even when tending towards towards modest support of multistakeholder models, tend to give disproportionate access to member state participants and issues. The efforts are too top down, this hampers success..
- Needs more independence from the UN even if still under an UN umbrella. One way to achieve this is to stop having the secretariat for GCS, WSIS, and IGF efforts all be controlled by the UN or organizations within the UN system. Even the secretariats need to adopt some of the multistakeholder attributes.
- Funding - the part of the Tunis Agenda that was never met. Perhaps becoming more bottom up, more open to the influence by stakeholders other than states, would help in putting together effective fundraising plans.

3. What are the most important **priorities** for action to achieve the WSIS vision of a 'people-centred, inclusive and development-oriented Information Society' in the future, taking into account emerging trends? \*

- Resolve the Enhanced Cooperation conundrum without continuing disruption and confusion.

There are those who believe that Enhanced Cooperation is for UN member states and intergovernmental organizations only, as they need to control internet and data governance. There are those who believe that multistakeholder models are all we need. Intervening years and events have shown that enhanced cooperation is necessary, and that it has to be among all stakeholders. Time has shown that one cannot eliminate organized member states and intergovernmental organizations from governance decision processes; not only are they human rights duty bearers, they have the power to act on their own and in the end, we have to obey. It is also clear, though, that Internet governance and governance of other emergent technologies, e.g. big data, AI, and quantum based cryptography, cannot be done without multistakeholder participation and mechanisms.

There are frequent efforts to induce actual cooperation between Multilateral and Multistakeholder efforts. Some informal, some formal. On the informal side, we see it all around. Over the years we have learned to cooperate and have enhanced this informal cooperation till it is difficult to tell where one stakeholder group starts and the other ends until we take our seats and discuss our defined positions. Informally, enhanced cooperation is a fact and helps us work together.

Formal Enhanced Cooperation, starting with recommendations around the time of WSIS+10, has become apparent as the two approaches accommodate to each other. Intergovernmental organizations being paired with multistakeholder partners in a variety of ways. At one end of the spectrum there is the example of the Freedom Online Coalition (FOC) and its multistakeholder Advisory Network (FOC-AN), where decisions are made by the member states in closed discussion, but there are open discussions and a healthy exchange of advice between them. At the other hand of the spectrum, there is ICANN, the composite of a multistakeholder policy organization, a traditional corporate structure, and a government body which has a Bylaws defined ability to pause a multistakeholder decision process and enter a complicated set of negotiations with ICANN's Board of Directors. There are many other examples of Multilateral and Multistakeholder processes cooperating to get things done throughout technology governance, examples which should be consulted moving forward.

- Understand the global necessity for capacity building and do something about it.

Almost every document that touches on a development or a governance theme has calls for capacity building. We need to take advantage of the many resources engaged in capacity building, or capable of capacity building, and organize them to cover the issues and populations more effectively. This is one area that the IGF is especially adept at. Capacity building is the essential work that is being done by IGF Policy Networks and by Dynamic Coalitions. This needs to be recognized, coordinated, and supported.

- Move toward greater use of Internet based communications and hybrid modes for consultations, deliberations and meetings in general.

In order to become more inclusive and development oriented, more of the world's people need to find means to participate. We cannot all travel to every meeting. We cannot all fit into any of the venues or cities. And even if those who are interested could all travel, our world could not endure the stress on resources and the environment. While all of the world's people are not yet on line, more and more of them are. Bringing inclusion into the ongoing discussion in all of the areas of the SDGs and governance needs to scale to the ever growing outreach we claim as our goal. We need to use the Internet, not only as an auxiliary for bad times of disease or disaster, but as a fundamental part of our practice.

4. What **additional themes/issues**, if any, should be included in the Elements Paper? \*

A practical issue: A fully formed hybrid methodology for all in person meetings in order to reach all the world's people.

In any of the activities, the procedures must normalize equitable online participation. Not only is it inadvisable to keep flying people around to meetings multiple times a year, most can neither afford it nor have the bandwidth. An in person only process cannot be properly inclusive.

Even while understanding that meetings in foreign time zones is difficult, it is still easier for most people than flying and jet lag. Sooner or later this will need to be dealt with. Sooner is better as it will take significant funding, work, time, and acclimation to achieve this necessary goal.

5. Do you wish to comment on **particular themes/issues/paragraphs** in the Elements Paper? \*

Funding.

Funding was known to be crucial from the start of the WSIS effort.  
Funding is the part that is most always left behind.  
Without funding, all the rest is a plan that cannot be adequately met.

While the work cannot wait for adequate funding to become available, adequate funding is necessary if we ever want to succeed with any of the many goals. For one thing, capacity building can barely occur in the absence of adequate funding. Best way to hobble capacity building is to deny funding. Whether intentional or accidental, being hobbled by the lack of funding is the case with governance mechanisms as well.

On funding, it may be worth considering an organizational framing that is open to facilitated global donation and less subject to political infighting. Better to have an organization that can raise funds in a way that ignores the political differences that rampage through the UN, despite diplomatic speech, and keep it from being an effective fund raiser.

6. What suggestions do you have to support the development of the **WSIS framework** (WSIS Action Lines, IGF, WSIS Forum, UNGIS etc.)? \*

In addition to greater multistakeholder participation in all phases of the many projects, not just pro-forma consultations, the Secretariat/Coordination efforts need to include more awareness, and even participation, by people from the other stakeholder groups; whether through consultants, or actual hires. In many cases, like the IGF, it would be better for it to have a multistakeholder secretariat, that is one that is not completely subject, or beholden, to US DESA control and UN processes. It is time for the UN to loosen its absolute control of the processes so that they have a better chance to succeed in a multistakeholder environment,

7. Do you have any **other** comments? \*

This current reality with regard to Enhanced Cooperation was a subtheme that was discussed extensively last year at NETMundial+10, a multistakeholder event that included member states and Intergovernmental organizations. They produced a set of guidelines for multilateral inclusive multistakeholder practice that I recommend be seriously considered as a base document for any effort going forward. (<https://netmundial.br/pdf/FinalReportNETmundial10.pdf>)

Given that, I think it is important to recall the section in the NETmundial+10 Multistakeholder Statement dedicated to the Multilateral processes in the light of Multistakeholder realities of Internet, Big Data, AI, and other evolving technologies. I also think it important to keep this advice in mind as we continue down the de facto path of Enhanced Cooperation. To that end I quote:

"Multilateral processes need to become more inclusive to ensure the meaningful participation of all stakeholders, especially from the Global South. Incorporating diverse voices and multiple worldviews by involving broader stakeholder input can enhance multilateral processes. Better decisions can be achieved and better delivery of outcomes assured through inclusive processes for adequate deliberation and consensus-building, based on the guidelines and process steps described below.

"To achieve these gains, all stakeholders should be empowered to contribute in a meaningful way to all stages of a process tackling issues of concern. The appointment of advisory/expert roles and/or platforms adequately resourced should be encouraged, to effectively facilitate and analyze diverse contributions from the agenda-setting phase, during deliberations, and on draft resolutions and texts, following agreed guidelines and timeframes and incorporating ethical and public interest considerations. Similarly, significant investments in capacity-building and education to strengthen each step of the process are vital to achieve effective contributions. It is important that such investments account for the relative power differences between and within different stakeholders and stakeholder groups.

"In the spirit of the multistakeholder principles, multilateral processes should evolve. They must share the scope of their work and publish a commitment regarding transparency of the process, including but not limited to a timeline highlighting critical opportunities for participation. As part of that commitment, a regular schedule to inform about their progress – or lack thereof – must be made available, including public access to specific outputs. Documentation of how contributions were made, evaluated and incorporated into the process is as important as the documentation related to dissenting and divergent views. Such mechanisms must follow accessibility standards and provide effective alternatives to facilitate participation in languages other than English.

"Robust accountability mechanisms should be part of all multilateral processes, so that there are clear steps and deadlines for the implementation of recommendations. Concrete mechanisms for reflection about the impact of their decisions and the status of implementation of their recommendations are key for continuity. Efforts to accurately document each multilateral process should be made, including concrete steps to identify linkages with other similar Processes.

"It is, therefore, essential to foster a safe, trustworthy and fair environment where imbalances between participants are addressed, and civil society, the private sector, academia and the technical community are able to meaningfully participate in multilateral processes. Governments have a key responsibility to guarantee the conditions for securing diversity and achieving robust multilateral processes."

As the UN based, and other intergovernmental, processes and institution unfold into the recommendations that the UN General Assembly vote on, please incorporate this advice into your work.

8. Who is **submitting** this input? \*

Kindly provide the name of the person submitting this input, as well as the associated country, organization, stakeholder type, and relevant contact information

Avri Doria; USA; Technical Community; Research Consultant, Technicalities

9. Please provide your **e-mail** address: \*

Please enter an email