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

> 1) Action lines still valid
> 2) multistakeholder approach, only way to deal with complexity of digital and AI related issues

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? *

> While WSIS has been successful in addressing various digital governance challenges with a technology neutral approach, several subject-matter gaps are emerging as the terminology and the technological progress advance. This calls for a review on how the WSIS framework applies in this new reality.
> Although the WSIS Action Lines have been mapped to the SDGs, the connection between digitalization and sustainable development could also be strengthened.
> Finally, in addition to subject-matter gaps, the WSIS framework faces several structural and operational
> challenges that hinder its effectiveness, inter alia the following:
> o Lack of a strategic and holistic governance of the WSIS framework
> o Limited synergies between different parts of the WSIS framework
> o Limited responsiveness to emerging developments
> o Limited political visibility, impact and funding of the IGF and sustainable development could be strengthened.
> All these challenges should be addressed

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? *

> Structure:
> 1) Updating the day-to-day stewardship of the WSIS framework and integrating GDC, under the leadership of an updated UNGIS
> 2) creating a Multistakeholder steering group to play the role of a strategic advisory body which would offer guidance to UNGIS in the implementation of the joint WSIS-GDC roadmap, monitor progress, and provide recommendations for addressing emerging challenges
> 3) Enhancing the multistakeholder character of CSTD
> 4) Enhancing IGF, so it is better interconnected with the rest of the WSIS framework and provide action-oriented recommendations
>
> Fields of action:
> 1) deal with cultural and linguistic diversity of digital content as a central issue
> 2) more comprehensive approach to data governance, and assistance to developing countries in this specific field
> 3) wide approach to digitla inclusion taking into consideration infrastructure, but also skills

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

> Our main concern (and the one of many other actors, including intergovernmental organisations) is the way the issue of cultural and linguistic diversity is dealt with in the document.
> The development of AI, which by definition relies on digitalized data present on internet (currently excluding hundreds of languages and cultures), makes the requirement for cultural and linguistic diversity — as defined in particular in the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions — an absolute necessity for the survival of the cultural and linguistic environment of hundreds of millions of people.
> The OIF is convinced that it is a central issue, indispensable for inclusion, inclusivity and development of digital technologies. The para.33 dealing with this issue, is merely descriptive and only considers the challenge through the narrow angle of "automated translation services".
> The para.74 highlights, in a very generic manner, the necessity of an AI that would "foster diverse cultures and languages", without elaborating on the reasons why it should be so, and the ways it should be done.
> In order to have a concrete impact on the cultural and linguistic diversity of contents, the OIF and its member states recommend in particular:
> - Provisions to ensure linguistic and cultural transparency of data used to conceive and develop digital tools;
> - Provisions to force a digital actor operating in a developing country to allocate a percentage of its revenue to digitalize content in local and minority languages ;
> - Provisions to force a digital actor operating in a country that is not its own to offer a percentage to be defined of its services and content in local languages;
> - Guidelines to ensure regular auditing of AI tools and data along geographical, linguistic and gender criteria.

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

> The OIF shares all the objectives highlighted in the document and is satisfied with the recognition of digital inclusion and data governance as essential dimen-sions of digital cooperation for development. The digital divide in all its aspects (infrastructures but also access to technologies or digital skills) is a reality that needs to be tackled with strong will and detailed measures.
> Data governance is also of outmost importance to ensure that a lack of regulation in this sector does not limit the benefits of technology developments to a handful of private actors and nation states, in order to achieve the objectives of the 2030 Agenda while respecting human rights.
>
> However, although it remains difficult to define it precisely, the issue of digital sovereignty would need to be dealt with in a much more detailed manner, examining what it means in terms of both regulation and access to infrastructure, technology, ex-pertise or financial resources. And data governance as a whole would need a more comprehensive approach with the need to protect knowledge and not only data.
> As a concrete proposal, the OIF suggests the creation of an international Fund for the development of sovereign data centres in developing countries.

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

> In terms of institutional architecture, the OIF supports the strengthening of existing structures with GDC commitments integrated under an updated WSIS framework. The WSIS action lines should be updated with emerging subjects (AI, misinformation and disinformation etc.) rather than deleted or created.
> The multistakeholder approach of CSTD should be enhanced, as well as the IGF that should be renamed Digital Governance Forum to reflect the broader scope of its activities.
> We also believe that further consideration should be given to ways of ensuring that the various stakeholders represented within the WSIS and the IGF are truly representative. Similarly, deliberative procedures need to be strengthened in order to guarantee both the quality and transparency of the proposals emerging from the multi-stakeholder model. IGF discussions should be summarized in action-oriented and forward-looking messages.
> Finally, this model should be linked to the inter-state deliberative forum constituted by the United Nations General Assembly (or any similar mechanism) in the manner of a bicameral system.

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

> the OIF is ready to work with member states as well as other actors, in particular to sensitize around the issue of diversity

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

> Antoine Barbry. Coordinator program "governing digital and AI technologies" of the Organisation internationale de la Francophonie (OIF) based at the Permanent mission of OIF to the UN Geneva

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

Please enter an email