

## فريق العمل العربي للمشاركة في استبيان شبكة المبادرات الوطنية والإقليمية (NRIs)

### حول لسبل التعاون الرقمي

#### ملخص

في إطار التقرير الصادر عن اللجنة رفيعة المستوى للأمين العام للأمم المتحدة بشأن التعاون الرقمي (HLPDC)، وهي اللجنة التي ضمت خبراء من مختلف فئات أصحاب المصلحة ومن مجالات عدة، والتي كان الأمين العام للأمم المتحدة قد شكلها بهدف استشراف الرؤى حول سبل تعزيز التعاون الرقمي وتشكيل المقاربات المستقبلية حياله، والنماذج المقترحة للتعاون الرقمي، ومن بينها ما يمكن تسميته اصطلاحاً "نموذج المنتدى المطور لحوكمة الإنترنت" (IGF Plus كما سماه التقرير) من بين النماذج التي عددها التقرير (IGF+; Distributed Co-Gov; Digital Commons).

وفي إطار الاستبيان الذي أطلقته شبكة المبادرات الوطنية والإقليمية (NRIs) والذي استهدف بالأساس المنتديات الوطنية والإقليمية حول تنفيذ التوصية ٥ أ / ب والنماذج المقترحة لسبل التعاون الرقمي، مع استهداف نظرة مقربة على نموذج المنتدى المطور لمنتدى حوكمة الإنترنت (IGF Plus)

قامت أمانة المنتدى العربي لحوكمة الإنترنت وبالتنسيق مع رئاسة اللجنة الاستشارية للمنتدى العربي وفريقي الإسكوا وجامعة الدول العربية منظمي المظلة للمنتدى، بدعوة المهتمين من مجتمع الإنترنت العربي عبر القائمة البريدية المفتوحة للمنتدى للمشاركة في جهود تشاركية عن المنطقة العربية والحث على مشاركة فعالة من أصحاب المصلحة لبحث ودراسة القضايا والاطروحات التي تناولها الاستبيان المشار إليه، واستطلاع مختلف وجهات النظر من المنطقة العربية ومجتمع المنتدى العربي لحوكمة الإنترنت حولها.

وعليه، فقد تم تشكيل فريق عمل مصغر تولى كلا من السيد/ قصي الشطي، الخبير الدولي في حوكمة الإنترنت، والسيدة/ حنان بوجيمي، خبير سياسات الإنترنت، مهام التنسيق المشترك لأعمال الفريق وإدارة جلساته، وإعداد ملخص بكافة الآراء والمقترحات التي تناولها المشاركون خلال اجتماعات الفريق التي تم تنظيمها عن بعد، بالإضافة إلى ما تم عرضه من آراء ووجهات النظر عبر نموذج Google Document أعدته أمانة المنتدى وضم أسئلة الاستبيان، بهدف استعراض كل وجهات النظر والوصول إلى آراء توافقية تعكس الرؤى العربية حيال مستقبل حوكمة الإنترنت والتعاون الرقمي، وتعكس الاهتمامات المشتركة للبلدان العربية الشقيقة. وقد حرص أعضاء الفريق على الاجتماع بشكل يومي خلال الأيام الماضية، وتم عقد ٦ اجتماعات عن بعد خلال الفترة ١٦-٢١ مايو ٢٠٢٠، وقد أنهى الفريق أعماله في يوم الخميس ٢١ مايو ٢٠٢٠ وفوض أمانة المنتدى بتعبئة نموذج الاستبيان، ومن جانبها قامت الأمانة بتعبئة وارسال الاستبيان يوم الجمعة ٢٢ مايو ٢٠٢٠ (مرفق)

شارك في أعمال الفريق السيدات والسادة التالي أسماؤهم:

### أولاً: منسقى فريق العمل

- ١- قصي الشطي، الرئيس الأسبق للجنة الاستشارية للمنتدى العربي لحوكمة الإنترنت، منسق فريق العمل، الكويت
- ٢- حنان بوجيمي، نائب رئيس اللجنة الاستشارية للمنتدى العربي لحوكمة الإنترنت، منسق فريق العمل، المغرب

### ثانياً: المشاركون

- ٣- أحمد فرج، الجهاز القومي لتنظيم الاتصالات، أمانة المنتدى، مصر
- ٤- إبياء عويشق، وزارة الاتصالات والتقانة، سوريا
- ٥- أيمن الشربيني، لجنة الأمم المتحدة الاقتصادية والاجتماعية لغربي آسيا – الإسكوا، لبنان
- ٦- أيه إبراهيم، لجنة الأمم المتحدة الاقتصادية والاجتماعية لغربي آسيا – الإسكوا، لبنان
- ٧- حازم حزه، جامعة الدول العربية، مصر
- ٨- زهر بو غانم، لجنة الأمم المتحدة الاقتصادية والاجتماعية لغربي آسيا – الإسكوا، لبنان
- ٩- شارل شعبان، أبو غزالة للملكية الفكرية، الأردن
- ١٠- شفيق شيا، رايب إن سي سي، الإمارات العربية المتحدة
- ١١- فيصل البيولي، وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي وتكنولوجيا المعلومات والاتصال، تونس
- ١٢- كرستين عريضة، الجهاز القومي لتنظيم الاتصالات، مصر
- ١٣- مصطفى خطاب، المنظمة العربية للتنمية الإدارية، مصر
- ١٤- منصور فرح، (مستقل)، سوريا
- ١٥- ميرنا بربر، لجنة الأمم المتحدة الاقتصادية والاجتماعية لغربي آسيا – الإسكوا
- ١٦- هادي رضوان، لجنة الأمم المتحدة الاقتصادية والاجتماعية لغربي آسيا – الإسكوا، لبنان
- ١٧- هشام أبو اليزيد، الجهاز القومي لتنظيم الاتصالات، مصر

## **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.

Youth representation should be reinforced in the composition of the AG, the private sector from under-represented regions, small civil society organisations, create a balance between governmental and non-governmental groups in the AG, IGO's should be considered as separate stakeholders. It is important that the AG should be balanced geographically, in addition to being gender sensitive. Moreover, there should be a balance among stakeholder representation should be clear

- 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. (Answer)**
- ✓ Other (150 words or less)

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

To ensure relevant topics to their expertise are discussed with them directly

**Sectors and Stakeholders:**

- Digital economy and the orgs linked to it
- Groups dealing with cyber security
- Youth
- Sociology
- Philosophy
- Futurist
- Technical community
- Academics

---

### **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)*

Outreach should be added as a task to the AG responsibilities. AG members could potentially assume an engaging role in the wider IG related regional processes in their respective regions by providing specific expertise on the topic to the relevant/concerned stakeholders. They can also liaise with other fora beyond the IGF community (example: WEF, Davos, Arab Economic Summit )

---

### **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):**

Parliamentarians	For example, We think that parliamentarians’ role is more important than being a stakeholder in the MAG. They can specifically enrich the intersessional work of the IG.
Cultural influencers	For example, each region has its own specific values/traditions/language. Cultural leaders could be also included in the discussion to provide their input in the process .
Consumer rights association	The shift to global digital platforms require reinforcing mechanisms to protect the rights of consumers.

---

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

- 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.**
- Inclusion of IGF outputs on the regional and national digital agendas.**
- Other (150 words or less)**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IGF+ could produce outputs to be disseminated in the relevant channels, which could inform policy making processes about the issues at stake. A task force can be formed to follow up on the dissemination of these messages to ensure the outputs of the IGF+ are taken into account.</li> <li>- There is a need to test the multistakeholder model to identify if it is generating the required outcomes because not all stakeholders are evenly represented in the process.</li> <li>- Define specific mechanisms where the cooperation accelerator can track and follow up the outcome of the discussion with the relevant agencies/ministries/corporations</li> </ul>
---

---

## **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)*

*The cooperation accelerator process should be a continuous process pre and post IGF to reach consensus on the issues discussed.*

---

## **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)

In addition to above-mentioned stakeholders, we could include social/ content/cultural platforms, regional and national IGF's, business associations, e-commerce platforms, consumer rights associations.

---

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

Accelerators could play a proactive role in cooperating by reaching out to the concerned stakeholders specified in the agenda to ensure the outcome of the discussion on Internet governance centric topics is elaborated on in other fora not taking part in the forum.

Accelerators to build consensus among the key stakeholders at the national level to facilitate regional and global integration in the policy discourse

---

## **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?***

- A policy incubator could host incubation groups based on expertise relevant to the topic in focus.
- A policy incubator could possibly contribute to formulating concrete policy outcomes and ensure the active participation of high-level policymakers and industry representatives with all the other stakeholders.

- Working groups/task force members who can discuss/reach, in a specific timeframe, a common ground on policy considerations relevant to emerging issues. These groups should be multistakeholder and balanced in representation

*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?*

**Helpdesk:** NRI's, regional IGO's and UN relevant regional institutions can play a key role in the regional anchoring of public policy issues.  
The helpdesk can be a resource to help various stakeholders understand current policy challenges and the available resources to improve their understanding of these issues.  
**Observatory:** could produce policy briefs that are specific/accurate to help inform policy making processes, and design policy benchmarking tools to identify the relevant gaps at the global and regional levels.

*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
  - UN regular Budget
  - IFC (International Finance Corporation could be part of the funders )

Professional fundraiser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The fundraiser could be hosted at the IGF secretariat</li> <li>- Funding should be dedicated to the overall implementation of the IGF+ strategy and not topic/theme specific</li> <li>- Oversight mechanism to oversee expenditure</li> <li>- There should be a clear charter for the UN trust fund that specifies the structure and the governance.</li> <li>- An endowment could be created to generate a return that will sustain the IGF and to make sure the expenditure is generated from the returns and not the capital.</li> <li>- The funding could be also used to support NRI's</li> </ul>
-------------------------	---

**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?***

IGF+ should address topics in a focused/agile way. Through a predefined policy incubation process. The IGF+ could produce outputs in various formats to respond the needs/requirements of the involved stakeholders

*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?*

- Streamlining information to ensure all the updates are received by regions/countries.
- An engagement strategy should be designed to outreach the concerned entities (tailored communication should ensure official invitations are issued to east represented. stakeholder groups/ ministries/ agencies) this could increase the IGF's visibility and improve coordination. It could also facilitate the engagement of the relevant entities in the policy dialogue.
- Provide communication in UN official languages.

---

**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.

The importance of linking IGF+ to the UN's Secretary General will mean all the issues derived from its agenda will be addressed imminently by the various UN agencies linked to them.

Linking the IGF and digital cooperation will be important to the political relevance of the forum, and it could be concretely implemented by the suggested option to appoint a special envoy by the UN's Secretary General.

---

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?

- |   |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- We think that the NRI's could promote the work of IGF SA at the regional level to diversify funding sources.</li><li>- We think that It's important to align IGF+ model with the 2030 agenda to make sure that the overall purpose of the forum links to issues highlighted in the WSIS agenda and SDG's.</li><li>- In the spirit of digital cooperation, we suggest looking into the option of syncing the annual WSIS process with the IGF+model.</li><li>- Output of the IGF+ could be presented to the UN's General Assembly to get feedback on the outcomes and to get guidelines/input for further steps.</li></ul> |
|---|

