National, Regional, Sub-regional and Youth IGF Initiatives (NRIs)
Survey for NRIs communities on recommendation 5A/B of the High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation

Introduction to the Survey

The High-level Panel on Digital Cooperation (HLPDC) submitted the report “The Age of Digital Interdependence” to the UN Secretary-General on 10 June 2019. The report describes a world which is more deeply interconnected than ever before as a result of digital technology, yet is struggling to manage the economic, social, cultural and political impacts of the digital transformation. The Panel’s report makes recommendations emphasizing the importance of leaving no one behind in the digital age and on how digital cooperation and technology can contribute to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, with a focus on issues of human rights, human agency, trust and security in the digital age, and with special regard to the critical issue of artificial intelligence.

In Recommendation 5 A/B, the report calls for a strengthened architecture for global digital cooperation. It identifies gaps and challenges in current arrangements, proposes three potential options for governance architecture and calls upon the UN Secretary-General to set up an agile and open Multistakeholder consultation process to develop updated mechanisms for global digital cooperation, using the options proposed by the Panel as a starting point.

The objective of the survey is to provide input from the National, Sub Regional, and Regional IGF Initiatives (NRIs) to the follow up process on Digital Cooperation Architecture lead by the Government of Germany, Government of the United Arab Emirates and Office of USG Hochschild. It will focus primarily on inputs from NRIs on IGF + architecture.

To learn more about the three architectures for Global Digital Cooperation proposed by HLPDC, review this document.

* Data you submit via this form is only available to the NRIs Task Force that will synthesize received input into a unique document. Your name and inputs, as indicated, will be noted on the final synthesis document. No information submitted will be transferred to any third parties and used for any other purpose except for the indicated purpose of this survey.

- ◯ I Agree

National, Regional, Sub-regional and Youth IGF Initiatives (NRIs)
Survey for NRIs communities on recommendation 5A/B of the High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation

The NRIs are requesting participation from NRIs, their respected communities and anyone else interested in Internet Governance and stakeholders primarily focused on IGF+ Architecture. This survey is developed by an NRIs task force made up of a number of coordinators from the NRIs. Inputs will be synthesized and submitted as a formal submission to the co-champions of Recommendation 5A/B of HLPDC, as part of the follow-up process on the Panel's recommendations related to the Digital Cooperation Architecture

The survey was built by several NRIs through an open, consultative, bottom-up process. Its outputs will be transparently synthesized by the NRIs for submission to the mentioned co-champions.

Please provide your responses by 21st of May.

* 1. Which of the three models best pursue Global Digital Cooperation?

- ◯ IGF +
- ◯ DISTRIBUTED CO-GOVERNANCE ARCHITECTURE (COGOV)
- ◯ DIGITAL COMMONS ARCHITECTURE

* 2. Should the Advisory Group have the same structure as the current MAG?

The structure of the current MAG is explained in the group's Terms of reference, available at https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/mag-terms-of-reference

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

2a. If you selected 'no' for the previous question, what changes should be brought to the structure of the Advisory Group (AG) (compared to the MAG)?

Some examples of changes are provided. You can also provide up to a 150 word description of your suggested structure of the Advisory Group and how this is different from the MAG.

- ☐ The number of AG members should be clear, with a defined term of years to serve on the AG.
- ☐ The AG should include representatives from additional sectors (compared to the sectors currently represented on the MAG). For example, in recent years, an emphasis has been put on the need to engage additional sectors, such as parliamentarians, youth, academic researchers, philosophers, economists, futurists, etc.
- ☐ Other (150 words or less)

If you indicated that the AG should include representatives from additional sectors, please specify which sector(s).

* 3. Do you think the Advisory Group responsibilities should be broader and different than those performed by MAG?

The responsibilities of the current MAG are explained in the group's Terms of reference, available at https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/mag-terms-of-reference

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

3a. If yes, please suggest which responsibilities you propose for the Advisory Group? (150 words or less)

3b. If not, please explain why. (150 words or less)

* 4. In recent years, an emphasis has been put on the need to engage additional sectors, such as parliamentarians, youth, academic researchers, philosophers, economists, futurists, etc. in IGF activities. Should these or other sectoral representatives be more involved in the IGF overall?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

4a. Please explain your answer (150 words or less):

* 5. Which of the following suggestions will support IGF+ to produce more tangible outputs?

- ☐ Issuing recommendations at the global level to be considered by IGOs, Governments, SMEs, NGOs, Technical Communities, etc.
- ☐ Involvement of parliamentarians in the IGF could take the form of a "network" to enable sharing of information for the awareness of IGF outputs at national and regional level.
- ☐ Increased awareness of the purpose and activities of the IGF, through increased outreach to NRIs, IGOs, NGO networks, etc. .
- ☐ Inclusion of IGF outputs on the regional and national digital agendas.
- ☐ Other (150 words or less)

* 6. Do you think the Cooperation Accelerator is a useful element of IGF + architecture?

The Co-operation Accelerator would support cooperation among existing organisations and processes on specific issues.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

6a. If yes, do you think current Best Practice Forums (BPFs) intersessional activities could implement this element?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

6b. If not, how should the Cooperation Accelerator look in terms of composition/membership as well as its responsibilities? (150 words or less)

* 7. The main function of the Cooperation Accelerator would be to facilitate cooperation across a wide range of institutions, organisations and processes. What specific institutions, organisations and processes should the Accelerator focus on?

- ☐ Technical Internet organisations such as ICANN, IETF, IEEE
- ☐ Standards or policy organisations addressing policy areas with digital dimensions, such as food, healthcare, weather, environment, intellectual property, etc.
- ☐ UN agencies
- ☐ World and regional financial institutions
- ☐ Other IGOs
- ☐ Further describe which other entities should be included (150 words or less)

8. Do you have any suggestions on how the Accelerator could facilitate such cooperation?

* 9. Do you think the Policy Incubator is a useful element of IGF + architecture?

The Policy incubator would monitor, examine, and incubate policies and norms for public discussions and adoption.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

9a. If yes, how should it look in terms of composition/membership as well as its responsibilities?

9b. If no, please describe why.

* 10. Do you think the Observatory and Help Desk are useful elements of IGF + architecture?

The Observatory and Help Desk would provide an overview of digital policy issues, coordinate capacity development activities, and provide help and assistance on digital cooperation and policy issues.

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

10a. If yes, how should it look like in terms of composition/membership as well as its responsibilities?

10b. If no, please describe why.

* 11. The present approach to funding for the IGF is a combination of voluntary contributions from governments, technical Internet organizations, private sector. At present, a UN Trust Fund, administered by UN DESA receives funds and manages the UN Trust Fund. It has been acknowledged that funding is not at the needed level to support the work of the IGF and that more funding is needed to fulfill the Project Agreement that defines the activities of the IGF. Additional funding is needed for the IGF+, as proposed. Do you think the funding mechanism included in the IGF + architecture is sustainable?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

11a. If not, how funding could be increased and improved? What are some options for additional funding sources/contributors?

- ☐ A professional fundraiser reporting into the IGF Secretariat
- ☐ Additional outreach to foundations
- ☐ Funds from the World Bank/regional banks;
- ☐ Additional funds from industry groups, such as WEF
- ☐ Additional funds from countries
- ☐ Other (please specify)

* 12. Do you think the IGF should have a strengthened role in addressing IG public policies?

- Yes
- No

12a. If yes, How this could be achieved?

12b. If not, please explain why

13. Is improved communications regarding the work of the IGF needed?

- Yes
- No

13a. If yes, how do you suggest such improvements are implemented?

13b. If no, please explain your reason.

* 14. The IGF was established as a project of the UN Secretary-General's office. The Panel recommended that the IGF Plus Secretariat be linked to the Office of the UN Secretary-General to reflect its interdisciplinary and system-wide approach. (Currently, the IGF Secretariat is anchored within the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs.)

Do you support the Panel's recommendation?

- Yes
- No

14a. Please explain your choice.

This section asks general questions regarding the two other architectures, but is limited to text of no more than 150-200 words.

15. Could aspects/features of the COGOV Architecture be further considered for potential inclusion in the IGF+ model? Which ones and how?

Enter text of no more than 150-200 words.

16. Could aspects/features of the Digital Commons Architecture be further considered for potential inclusion in the IGF+ model? Which ones and how?

Enter text of no more than 150-200 words.

17. Do you have any further comments on the three architectures?

Enter text of no more than 150-200 words.

Demographic Section

* Name

Gender

- Male
- Female
- I prefer not to answer

Age

- Under 18
- 18-29
- 30-44
- 45-64
- 65+

Region

- ◯ Africa
- ◯ Asia Pacific
- ◯ Eastern Europe
- ◯ Latin American and Caribbean Group
- ◯ Western Europe and Others Group

Stakeholder Groups

- ☐ Academia
- ☐ Civil Society
- ☐ Government
- ☐ Private Sector
- ☐ Technical Community
- ☐ Intergovernmental Organization

* You are submitting this contribution:

- ◯ On behalf of an NRI
- ◯ On behalf of your organization
- ◯ In a personal capacity

If you submit this contribution, please indicate the NRI name.

If you submit this contribution on behalf of your organization, please indicate its name