The following is an expanded version of the remarks prepared by Avri Doria of Technicalities, a participant from the Technical Community for the Follow-up WSIS+20 Informal Stakeholder Consultation Session of 29 July 2025. A more condensed version was included in a response to the <u>Elements</u> paper.

I want to make 4 basic suggestions:

- Resolve the Enhanced Cooperation conundrum without the continuing disruption and confusion
- 2. Understand the global necessity for capacity building and the need to do something concrete about it.
- 3. Continue to move toward greater and evolved use of Internet based communications and hybrid modes for consultations, deliberations and meetings in general.
- 4. Recall advice from the NETmundial+10 Multistakeholder Statement dedicated to Multilateral processes in the light of the stakeholder realities: of the Internet, of pervasive surveillance and Data, of AI, of Quantum and other evolving technologies.

Expanding on those remarks below.

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

As a former participant in the first WG on Enhanced Cooperation I point out that there are frequent efforts to enhance the cooperation between Multilateral and Multistakeholder processes. For example, these consultations. Some of these efforts are successful. These efforts need to be nurtured and expanded. They are the Enhanced Cooperation that we need.

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.

Not only did I have the honor of serving on the WGIG as a technical member of civil society, before the Technical Community was acknowledged as being a stakeholder, where Enhanced Cooperation was not discussed as I recall, I also had the opportunity to be among those outside the room when

this was sprung on the WSIS as a counter foil to the fact of an Internet governed and maintained by many diverse stakeholders guided by a set of ideas that fall under the rubric of multistakeholderism: that is, the study, implementation, and practice of multistakeholder models. I also had the honor of serving on the first Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation (WGEC) at a time where I was one of those who believed that all we needed was the right multistakeholder model. Time has shown me that one cannot eliminate the states and intergovernmental organizations, with their multilateral practices, from governance decision processes; not only are they human rights duty holders, they have the power to act on their own and in the end, we have to follow their laws. However, I am also still convinced that Internet governance and governance of other technological emergents, e.g. data, AI, and Quantum based cryptography, cannot be done properly without full multistakeholder participation and mechanisms. Thus the conclusion that the two systems have to find a way to work with enhanced cooperation.

There are frequent efforts to introduce actual cooperation between Multilateral and Multistakeholder efforts. Some informal, some formal. On the informal side, we see it all around. Participants from every stakeholder group interact: we eat together, we drink together, we party together, we become friends and some even wed. Over the years we have learned to cooperate and have enhanced this informal cooperation till it is sometimes 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 opinion between them. At the other end of the spectrum, there is ICANN, the composite of a multistakeholder policy organization, a traditional corporate non profit corporation, and a government body, which has a Bylaws defined ability to pause the ICANN multistakeholder decision process and enter a complicated set of negotiations with the corporation'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 and studied moving forward. It can be done, we just have to increase our capacity to do so.

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

As the Coordinator of Schools of Internet Governance, I want to emphasize that this is an area that the IGF is adept at. Capacity building is the essential work that is being done by IGF Policy Networks and by Dynamic Coalitions, among others. This needs to be recognized, coordinated, and supported. Financial support is necessary in order to do something about capacity building.

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 people and 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. Support needs to be financially significant and it needs to be sustained far into the future.

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

As a participant in the technical community for over 3 decades, I want to argue that In order to become more inclusive and development oriented, more of the world's people need to have the means to participate in their own governance. While we still need to close the connectivity gaps, we also need to move beyond connectivity for those connected: to being able to use it for access to, and participation in, all forms of Internet and digital governance. We cannot all travel to meetings. We cannot all fit into any of the venues or cities. Only the Internet can accommodate us all. I appreciate its use on this occasion.

While all of the world's people are not yet on line, more and more of them are. Bringing inclusion into the ongoing discussions 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 in bad times of disease or disaster, but as a fundamental part of our practice.

4. Recall advice from the NETmundial+10 Multistakeholder Statement dedicated to Multilateral processes in the light of the stakeholder realities: of the Internet, of pervasive surveillance and data collection, of AI, of Quantum and other evolving technologies.

This current reality with regard to Enhanced Cooperation was a subtheme that was discussed extensively last year at NETMondial+10, a multistakeholder event that included member states and Intergovernmental organizations as well as other stakeholders. They produced a set of guidelines, The Sao Paulo 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 critical to recall the section in the NETmundial+10 Multistakeholder Statement dedicated to the Multilateral processes in the light of Multistakeholder realities of Internet, of pervasive surveillance and data collection, of AI, and of 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 we find ourselves on.

"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 institutions unfold into the recommendations that the UN General Assembly vote on, I ask the member states in the UN General Assembly to please incorporate this advice into your work going forward.

With my thanks for the way the consultation was held; with flexibility and patience that allowed all who wanted to participate to do so.