

IGF 2018 - BPF Summaries/Handbook

Table of contents

Table of contents	1
Introduction	2
What are BPFs?	2
How do BPFs work?	3
When and where do BPFs do their work?	3
Best Practice Forum on Cybersecurity	4
Best Practice Forum on Local Content	6
Best Practice Forum on Gender and Access	9
Best Practice Forum on Internet of Things (IoT), Big Data, Artificial Intelligence (AI)	12

Introduction

The Internet Governance Forum (IGF), which was called for in section 72 of the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society¹, brings people together from various stakeholder groups as equals, in discussions on public policy issues relating to the Internet.

The 13th annual meeting of the IGF was held from the 12th to the 14th of November 2018 in Paris, France. More than 3,000 delegates from 143 countries attended the meeting, both onsite and remotely. These participants discussed, exchanged information and shared good practices with each other with the aim of facilitating a common understanding of how to maximise the Internet's opportunities and to address risks and challenges that have arisen and that may occur in the future. The IGF programme, with 171 sessions, was developed in a bottom up and inclusive manner in consultation with the growing IGF community, with a view to enhance wide-ranging and diverse multistakeholder participation.

The IGF intersessional programme, consisting of Best Practice Forums (BPFs) and other initiatives, intends to complete the IGF community activities with community-driven work in between the annual meetings culminating in more tangible outputs to 'enhance the impact of the IGF on global Internet governance and policy'.² After community consultation and open deliberation the MAG selected the BPF topics for the 2018 programme:

- Cybersecurity,
- Internet of Things (IoT), Big Data and Artificial Intelligence (AI),
- Gender and Access, and
- Local Content.

What are BPFs?

BPFs are working groups created by the IGF with the aim of facilitating dialogue and collecting emerging and existing practices to address specific issues or themes. By nature multistakeholder environments, BPFs and the IGF offer unique platforms to bring together diverse stakeholders – including civil society, the technical community, governments, intergovernmental organizations, academia, users and young people, for instance – to address pertinent topics in a holistic manner using these dedicated working groups.

BPFs offer substantive ways for the IGF to produce more tangible and substantial outcomes. Like other intersessional activities, BPF outcomes are designed to become robust resources, to serve as inputs into other pertinent forums, and to evolve and grow over time. While BPF outcome documents have already been useful in informing policy debates, they are also iterative materials that acknowledge the need for flexibility in light of the pace of technological change Internet policymakers constantly need to adapt to.

¹ World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) (18 November 2005). Tunis Agenda for the Information Society (WSIS-05/TUNIS/DOC/6(Rev. 1)-E). Available: <http://www.itu.int/net/wsis/docs2/tunis/off/6rev1.html> .

² The intersessional programme was designed in accordance with the recommendations of the 2012 report by the UN General Assembly (UNGA) Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) Working Group on Improvements to the IGF (16 March 2012) (A/67/65-E/2012/48). Available: http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/a67d65_en.pdf .

How do BPFs work?

BPFs have the freedom to define and delineate the parameters of their work in consultation with their respective multistakeholder communities; to define their own methodologies; and to tailor their work to their theme's specific needs and requirements. In general terms, however, all BPFs use open and transparent working approaches with the aim of encouraging and gathering broad stakeholder input. The outcomes of each BPF are intended to be community-driven, bottom-up and a true reflection of the multistakeholder nature of the IGF's intersessional activities.

When and where do BPFs do their work?

BPFs do much of their work in the year between annual IGF meetings using primarily online and virtual platforms that are accessible to stakeholders from all over the world. While some BPFs do their work for approximately one term – or the year between annual IGF meetings – other BPFs have been operational for two or more consecutive years.

Each BPF has a unique platform on the IGF's website that it updates with relevant information, a dedicated mailing list on which it can communicate to and with participants, and most BPFs hold regular virtual meetings that anyone is welcome to attend. In addition, each BPF also has a 90-minute session at the annual IGF meeting at which it has the opportunity to present its preliminary findings and to further dialogue and debate about the topic(s) concerned.

This handbook collates summarised versions the 2018 BPF outputs with the aim of providing the community with a snapshot guide on the important topics covered by these diverse BPFs³.

³ BPFs Archived Content: <https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/bpfs-archived-content>

Best Practice Forum on Cybersecurity

Best Practice Forum on Cybersecurity output document at

http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/filedepot_download/6764/1437

High Level Summary

Since 2014, the IGF has operated a Best Practice Forum focused on cybersecurity. In 2014-2015, the BPF worked on identifying Best Practices in Regulation and Mitigation of Unsolicited Communications and Establishing Incident Response Teams for Internet Security. Later, the BPF has been focused on cybersecurity; identifying roles and responsibilities and ongoing challenges in 2016, and identifying policy best practices in 2017.

For 2018, the Best Practices Forum focused its work on the culture, norms and values in cybersecurity. The plan of action to approach this topic consisted of:

- The BPF started the process by building on its previous work on the roles and responsibilities of the IGF stakeholder groups in cyberspace and explore what norms have developed that apply to each of these groups. Some of the questions the BPF explored relate to the behaviour of each stakeholder group, such as “state behaviour” or “industry behaviour”. The discussion of civil society’s role in norms development includes social norms of safe and secure online behaviour by individual users.
- The BPF identified sample norms established by various forums, documenting and comparing them. The BPF did so by engaging experts, BPF contributors and the IGF’s network of National and Regional IGF initiatives (NRIs). Through this network, BPFs can bring in a developing country perspective and connect the NRIs with the norms development communities, to promote a culture of cybersecurity. The BPF also collected information on how they are articulated, implemented and whether they are successful.
- The BPF leveraged the work from last year to identify if any of the policy recommendations may see widespread acceptance, and may have developed into a recognized “best practice”.
- The BPF aimed to understand the impact of a “digital security divide”. When or where there’s no real universal implementation of a norm, or if the implementation of the norm has unintended consequences, or has different impacts in a different context (e.g. those with and those without effective rule of law), it may result in a group of “haves” and “have nots” in terms of the protection the norms offer. Security controls will be sufficient or meaningful in some parts of the world, and not in others. While these differences may exist regardless of norms, inappropriate norms implementation also may adversely affect users. This is an interesting area for investigation into the

reasons for non-adherence or potential barriers preventing the implementation.

- Finally, the BPF convened a meeting during the Paris IGF, bringing in experts from the norms development community to discuss the key issues in this space. Recording: <https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/igf-2018-day-3-salle-xii-bpf-cybersecurity>

At the beginning of the year, the BPF published a Background document that was developed with support from participants in the Best Practice Forum, and served as an introduction to the wider area. It was provided as background reading to anyone responding to the public Call for Input, which was released on August 15th. The Background document was later integrated in the final output document of the BPF.

The BPF output document brings together the research performed by the BPF, the inputs from 16 contributors to the call for input, and the contributions by experts and participants in the BPF session during the IGF meeting in Paris on November 14th. Key lessons learned include:

- **The importance of norms** as a mechanism in cybersecurity for state and non-state actors to agree on a responsible way to behave in cyberspace, given that the speed of legislation often struggles to keep up with the pace of changes in the sphere of cybersecurity. In addition to the development of norms, it is important that **stakeholders continue to focus on mechanisms for norms implementation**, to ensure their effectiveness.
- **The importance of multi-stakeholderism** – threats to cybersecurity impact governments, private companies and people. There are a number of helpful norms, on different aspects and from various parts of the world, but more needs to be done to involve non-state stakeholders in the development and implementation of norms. It should also be noted that there are several norms developed and proposed by non-state actors, which do not always get the same level of attention.
- **Cybersecurity norms and laws should be respectful of human rights**, and not stray into areas such as freedom of expression and control of content online. It is important to separate the security of the infrastructure, which this BPF is focused on, from questions of content shared online.

The BPF hopes that its work proves useful to develop the community's understanding of the complex but important area of cyber norms development, and provides insight in how we all partner on building a culture of cybersecurity that protects and enables society online.

Best Practice Forum on Local Content

Best Practice Forum on Local Content output document at https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/filedepot_download/5005/1441

High Level Summary

Local content is a returning topic at the IGF and considered to be a challenge that could benefit from continued cooperation and coordinated effort of all stakeholders. The 2018 BPF on Local Content builds on the work of the BPF in 2017 that discussed the relation between the development and growth of a local Internet and the availability of content and services that are relevant for the local Internet user. This year's BPF intends to take a next step and focus on the local development of content and a local content value chain

Local content and Internet uptake

Despite the rapid growth of the Internet and the considerable improvement of access in developing and remote areas, Internet uptake seems not to evolve at the same speed and keeps lagging behind in some areas. Access and cost directly relate to 'having the possibility to use the Internet', but it is the people's expectation and experience that the Internet brings useful and interesting content that motivates them to go online.

For the local Internet and in extension the local digital economy to develop, it is important that the content and services accessible and provided over the Internet are relevant for the local Internet user. Content must be in a language that is understood by the local population, and deal with matter of local interest. 'Relevant content, including which is generated locally and concerned with local issues, is necessary if people want to use the Internet in order to improve their quality of life or livelihoods, and to contribute to national development'⁴.

Focus of the 2018 BPF developing a Local Content value chain

Inspired by previous intersessional work and the discussions at the BPF Local Content workshop at the 2017 IGF meeting, the BPF Local Content in 2018 decided to focus on both enabling '**a sustainable local content value chain, and the economic viability of creating and providing locally relevant content**'.

The BPF observed three "realities" related to the local creation of local content:

1. New self-sustaining models for local content creation:

Local businesses, entrepreneurs, SMEs, etc. develop their own new models to create and commercialise content and be self-sustaining. New companies and start-ups are well placed to test innovative models, but also existing companies can search and develop new ways to create and commercialise local content.

2. The development of an enabling environment for local content creation:

⁴ <https://en.unesco.org/internetuniversality>

Numerous policies, projects, and initiatives in all parts of the world contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for the development of a sustainable local content industry. There's a broad spectrum of examples, such as IP legislation to protect online content of local creators⁵, initiatives to provide affordable local hosting to local content producers⁶, etc., but also schemes and programmes providing support to start-ups, SMEs, etc. to help them become self-sustainable.

3. Existing models promoting, supporting or subsidizing local content creation:

Existing models in legislation, regulation, incentives, international or national policies etc. have as goal to promote, support, and subsidize the local creation of local online content. An important part of these models are particularly focused on or limited to the creation of local online content of a cultural and educational nation and the transition from traditional media to digital platforms.

Case Studies

The BPF Local Content organised a face to face session at the 13th IGF meeting in Paris. The testimonials and case studies presented at the session and highlighted in the BPF output report cover different aspects of the creation of local content and a local content value chain. The examples are selected from different regions and sectors.

Affordable and high-speed wireless Internet in small mountain villages in the **Tusheti region** in Georgia opens new opportunities for tourism and preservation of the local culture. It provides an essential information and communication channel for healthcare and in case of emergencies, and supports the economic sustainability of the region amongst other by creating opportunities for businesses offering local products and services.

Continuous work on **Universal Acceptance** to assure that domain names and email addresses in non-ASCII scripts are widely accepted by applications is a fundamental requirement for a truly multilingual Internet, one in which users around the world can navigate entirely in their local languages.

The **African HUB project** brings African broadcasters from different countries together. It allows to pool financial resources to invest in co-produced local content, obtain the rights on premium content for their region, and to coordinate and offer advertising opportunities for a pan-African audience.

The 'Armenian Virtual College' offers courses in the Armenian language and courses on the Armenian culture and literature; the project 'Computers, Services and Wi-Fi Internet for Rural Libraries' provides rural libraries with computers and Internet access and supports the creation of open e-libraries; the 'TUMO Center for Creative Technologies' created a platform

⁵ See also the work of the 2014 BPF Local content on this topic.

⁶ The lack of affordable local hosting and related issues are discussed in the report of the 2017 BPF on Local content.

for online studying. They are examples of **education opportunities in the Armenian language**, local content availability, and open educational sources.

KASALA! is a movie filmed in the streets of Lagos (Nigeria), self-produced and directed by Ema Edosio. **KASALA!** is now touring around festivals around the world having great success. The movie has been simultaneously distributed in cinemas and through digital and online tools, opening the ways to new forms of financing.

Teenager is a long running TV and web series on the different facets of the life of young people in Ivory Coast. The content of the episodes is based on input from young people across the region. A community of 120,000 adolescents is now developing into a market for ancillary products, such as music records from local artists.

God Calling is a 2018 Nigerian movie that is simultaneously released in movie theaters, shown in churches, and made available digitally and on DVD, which opens the way to new forms of financing and helps to compete against piracy and traffic in illegal copies.

Proimágenes Colombia is a non-profit organization that administers the Film Development Fund (FDF) and the Columbian Film Fund (CFF). Both funds have proven successful at boosting the local film industry and the production of TV and more recently of webseries.

A recording of the workshop can be found here:

<https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/igf-2018-day-2-salle-xii-bpf-local-content>.



Best Practice Forum on Gender and Access

Best Practice Forum on Gender and Access output document at
https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/filedepot_download/5004/1455

High level summary

In 2018, the United Nations Internet Governance Forum (IGF) Best Practice Forum (BPF) on Gender and Access studied the potential impact of initiatives that support/develop supplementary models of connectivity that directly or indirectly respond to the needs of underserved populations of women and gender non-binary persons.

‘Supplementary models of connectivity’ refers to complementary telecommunication infrastructure models that not only speed up the pace at which unconnected populations can be supported with internet access, but also complement existing models in making communications accessible to all. Examples: Community Networks, Public Wifi, TV White Spaces, Zero Rating.

This work has built upon the work of the BPF in the previous years. In 2015, the BPF Gender looked at online abuse and gender-based violence, and identifying this as one of the barriers to access, in 2016 aimed to identify the different barriers that women face as regards Internet access. In 2017, the BPF on Gender and Access 2017 noted that some barriers are experienced more keenly by some women in certain communities than in others. The BPF Gender’s work in 2017 therefore focused on identifying the needs and challenges of various women’s groups, including refugee women, indigenous women, young women, women with disabilities, rural women and LGBTQIA+ women with respect to Internet access.

Like other intersessional initiatives, the BPF Gender has functioned in a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder, and community-driven manner to gather stories, experiences, and lessons. But as gender is a key and broad thematic area not only for its study but also for the other central IG and Internet policy matters, the BPF Gender has also worked hard to integrate gender issues within other IGF’s work.

Taking forward the work of the previous years in terms of the pertinent barriers commonly faced by women in gaining meaningful Internet access, this year, the outputs highlighted how supplementary models of connectivity can help make progress on these challenges. Some of the barriers that can be at least partially resolved through such models include availability; affordability; culture and norms; lack of capacity and skills; women’s participation in decision-making roles pertaining to the Internet and/or in the technology sector, and the lack of relevant capacities and digital literacy skills. The BPF this year also identified benefits of supplementary models of connectivity for women and gender non-binary persons.

Technology does not have a neutral impact and can and often does reproduce social, economic and cultural inequalities in the context it is deployed in. The BPF finds that this is also reflected in the supplementary models of connectivity explored in this year’s work. Thus, to have any impact on the ability of women and gender non-binary persons to

meaningfully benefit from the Internet, initiatives must take into account the disparate needs and demands of different genders and implement approaches that are specifically gender-focussed in their vision. This is why gender analysis must be an integral part of planning efforts, rather than an “add-on” task. However, merely having a gender focus is also not enough as gender always overlaps with sex, race, class, caste, religion, and ability. Thus, an intersectional approach is required and was adopted in the working of the BPF as well.

One of the key findings of this year’s work is that there is currently a severe lack of a gender focus in most initiatives that support and develop supplementary models of connectivity. Limited data was found to be available on such initiatives focusing uniquely on challenges that women face in accessing the Internet, and negligible data on the same for gender non-binary persons. This means that the unique challenges that women and gender non-binary persons face are not necessarily solved for in these models.

An interesting finding from the work was that even though many initiatives do not currently have a main gender focus, many respondents in the BPF surveys and the IGF 2018 session noted that these initiatives had the potential to be better customized to specifically address women and gender non-binary individuals.

This year’s work also mapped the (limited number of) existing supplementary model initiatives around the world that currently focus on women and gender non-binary persons as well as their impact, specifically for Community Networks, TV White Spaces and Public Wi-Fi. At the same time, the BPF acknowledges the power relations that impact the manner in which knowledge ‘travels’, and hence this work is sustained through these ‘living’ documents, and efforts will be made to update the lists with more initiatives as and when they are highlighted.

Lastly, the BPF identified some best practices for incorporating gender perspectives in initiatives of supplementary models of connectivity focusing on women and gender non-binary persons. Among others, these include-

- Encouraging broader gender classification of gender-disaggregated data: Collecting statistics that go beyond the male-female gender binary and recognizing and valuing gender non-binary experiences.
- Ensuring that agency is not tokenistic, so that women in decision-making roles within initiatives are not relegated to acting as political “proxies” for their male family members to exercise actual authority.
- Ensuring that patriarchal, white male dominated societal structures are not reproduced in supplementary models of connectivity.
- Valuing women’s (often invisible) labor and contributions within communities as an integral and inherent part of the social glue of initiatives supporting supplementary models of connectivity.
- Encouraging a bottom-up approach where the community is an active stakeholder in such models by finding effective methods of communicating with diverse communities.

- Making gender analysis an integral part of planning efforts every step of the way (from budgeting to implementation processes), rather than an “add-on” task in the end.
- Adopting an intersectional approach as gender always overlaps with sex, race, class, caste, religion, and ability.

The BPF Gender recommends that gender be a cross-cutting theme across all fora within IGF (and beyond) and that discussions on gender not be relegated to only specific forums that have a main focus on gender. The BPF also recommends that its work continues in 2019 and that renewed efforts be dedicated towards enabling the participation of all stakeholders in its work.



Best Practice Forum on Internet of Things (IoT), Big Data, Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Best Practice Forum on Iot, Big Data & AI output document at

http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/filedepot_download/6733/1438

High level summary

The BPF on Internet of Things (IoT), Big Data, Artificial Intelligence (AI) was part of the IGF intersessional work programme leading into the 2018 annual meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) in Paris, France, on 12-14 November 2018.

Devices, networks and applications used by billions of users around the world generate a vast variety and high volume of data. IoT, Big Data and AI play a critical role in connecting, analysing, and generating value from this growing amount of information. IoT, Big Data and AI discussions are present in many fields, in the on- and offline world. The BPF focussed on where these technologies are used in consort in an Internet context and where Internet governance can play a role in stimulating further development and widespread use, as well as helping to avoid unintended negative side-effects.

The expectations on how IoT, Big Data and AI are going to contribute to solving complex problems and facing global challenges related to the environment, transportation, health, etc. are high and complement a fast growing list of examples of how they support individual Internet users' daily lives. There are however a large number of unknowns, potential impacts, risks, and social and economic implications that ask for guidance, measures and policies for managing the impact of applying IoT, Big Data, AI technologies.

Stakeholder dialogue is crucial to allow the Internet to embrace IoT, Big Data and AI to the benefit of all. Each stakeholder group offers a unique understanding of how these technologies impact daily life, how to balance innovation with potential risks, and how to make the best of the opportunities while seeking ways to mitigate unwanted side-effects.

The BPF identified existing platforms and communication mechanisms for stakeholder discussion and collected examples and good practices of how stakeholder cooperation can help to mediate problems, avoid issues and support the use of IoT, Big Data, AI in the Internet. They are listed in section IV of the BPF output report.

The BPF identified two Best Practices for an efficient and effective stakeholder dialogue dealing with the IoT, Big Data, and AI in an Internet context:

#1 - Define your terms narrowly so that it is clear for policy makers and stakeholders what aspects of these technologies they are discussing.

Not doing so can lead to sweeping generalisations or proposals that are meant to address a problem with a narrow technology or specific application that could have a range of unintended consequences. Worse, conflating different technologies and different applications will cause discussions to lose focus and is likely to create fear.

#2 - Be ecumenical about technology (or “Strive to be technology-neutral”). Because technologies are changing so quickly and because potential problems with a specific application of a technology may or may not develop (or may be solved rapidly), it is dangerous and unproductive to try to write laws and regulations that cover one specific type of technology or one specific type of application. Best practices should focus on what an application DOES not on how the technology DOES IT.

IoT, Big Data and AI are powerful technologies and when combined they become even more powerful tools that can be used for good or evil. Using IoT, Big Data, AI in an Internet context, creates a number of Internet Governance challenges. The BPF discussion pointed amongst other to the cybersecurity of IoT devices, risks related to AI mass data processing, and potential threats to human rights, security and social cohesion. The BPF had extensive discussions about the necessity that these technologies be applied and further developed in ways that reflect ethical considerations and human rights.

The BPF identified the following Best Practices for stakeholders to take into account when discussing the use of IoT, Big Data and AI:

#3 - Collaborate to ensure that these technologies are deployed in ways that protect user privacy and security, and network resiliency while fostering innovation. Stakeholders should communicate openly about the impact new technologies have on the public and existing networks and find ways to work together to develop future-looking policies.

#4 - Consider ethics and human rights when applying IoT, Big Data, and AI from the outset in the development, deployment and use phases of the life cycle. This requires that users are aware of the benefits and risks deriving from these technologies.

#5 - Watch out for bias and incomplete data sets that may reflect only a small subset of the “real world” due to the Digital Divide, due to national regulations that restrict the export of consumer data, due to marketing decisions to only focus on certain geographies, demographics, or industry sectors. In some cases, statistical techniques can weight data to compensate for some problems. But in ALL cases, the limits of the data and Big Data analysis should be recognized.

#6 - Make privacy and transparency a policy goal and a business practice. Potential problems must be recognized before they become serious. Transparency is

one of the most effective ways to nurture trust, and can for example be achieved by the publication of transparency reports and such reports are likely to become more common and more detailed as the IoT enables data collection about more intimate aspects of our lives.

#7 - Ensure systems are adequately secured before they get to the market. A balance will need to be found to distinguish “flaws resulting from irresponsible behavior” to flaws that could not be foreseen at the time, whereas system development has followed good practice - industry self-regulation may be the best way forward as to avoid regulation that is stalling innovation.

#8 - Foster technologies and business practices that empower SMEs. The growth of edge computing⁷ and “serverless computing” promises to give SMEs much cheaper and simpler ways to create the software needed to exploit the power of the data generated by the Internet of Things. The best response to the threat of “Data Dominance” is not regulating monopolies, it is ensuring there are not monopolies by ensuring vibrant competition.

The BPF discussed the best practices and experiences at a session organised during the IGF meeting in Paris. Recording: <https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/igf-2018-day-3-salle-xii-bpf-artificial-intelligence-big-data-internet-of-things>

⁷ <https://www.economist.com/business/2018/01/18/the-era-of-the-clouds-total-dominance-is-drawing-to-a-close>