



IGF 2017

Best Practice Forums

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	7
Best Practice Forum on Gender and Access	10

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 twelfth annual meeting of the IGF was held from the 18th to the 21st of December 2017 in Geneva, Switzerland. More than 2,000 delegates from over 142 countries attended the meeting, while thousands more actively participated online. 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 over 200 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 2017 programme: Cybersecurity, 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/wsisis/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 2017 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

<https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/bpf-cybersecurity-1> .

High Level Summary

Introduction

The Best Practice Forum Cybersecurity explored how cybersecurity influences the ability of ICTs and Internet technologies to contribute to development and to support the achievement of the UN SDGs.

The BPF Cybersecurity was conceived in 2016 as a multi-year project that builds upon earlier IGF work of the BPF on Establishing and Supporting Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRTs) and the BPF on Regulation and Mitigation of Unsolicited Communications, both of which ran during 2014 and 2015.⁴ In 2017 the BPF Cybersecurity was part of the intersessional work programme leading into the twelfth meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF).

The BPF Cybersecurity worked in an open, bottom-up and collaborative manner, and relied on community input⁵ to collect suggestions on how to mitigate cybersecurity challenges, to identify stakeholder responsibilities, and to explore what critical cybersecurity issues would benefit from further multistakeholder conversation. The BPF made special effort to seek input from National and Regional IGF Initiatives (NRIs).

Connecting the Next Billion(s) Internet users - Cybersecurity challenges

Cybersecurity is a broad concept that covers many aspects, depending on context and expectations. Good cybersecurity helps to create trust and confidence in ICTs and Internet technologies what helps to stimulates their uptake and usage. A sufficient level of security has become indispensable to maximise the contribution of ICTs and Internet technologies to growth and development.

The BPF performed a cybersecurity analysis of the *IGF Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)* (CENB)⁶, a multi-year work programme aiming to develop comprehensive sets of policy recommendations based on broad consultations, bottom up crowdsourcing and cross-engaging the work of the different intersessional work tracks and IGF

⁴ Reports of previous BPFs are available on <https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/bpfs-archived-content>

⁵ The BPF received 27 formal contributions, input via its open mailing list and its virtual meetings, and during the BPF Cybersecurity workshop organised at the 2017 IGF Meeting in Geneva.

⁶ IGF Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s), <https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/igf-policy-options-for-connecting-and-enabling-the-next-billions>

initiatives. The first phase in 2015 (CENB I)⁷ focussed on infrastructure, increasing usability, enabling users, entering affordability and enabling environments. The subsequent phase in 2016 (CENB II)⁸ discussed how ICTs can help reach the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The BPF performed a cybersecurity assessment of the CENB output documents and identified a set of 10 potential risks and security challenges emerging from CENB policy recommendations.

The BPF's cybersecurity analysis of the IGF CENB policy options identified a set of 10 security challenges:

1. Securing the reliability of and access to Internet services;
2. Securing the mobile Internet;
3. Protecting against potential abuse by authorities;
4. Confidentiality and availability of sensitive information;
5. Fighting online abuse and gender-based violence;
6. Securing shared critical services and infrastructure supporting access;
7. Vulnerabilities in Industrial Control Systems (ICS) technologies;
8. Preventing collected information from being repurposed;
9. Deploy secure development processes;
10. Prevent unauthorized access to devices.

Six additional policy challenges were added based on community input:

1. Awareness building and capacity development;
2. Supporting cyber resiliency of cities;
3. Lack of diversity in cybersecurity;
4. Cryptocurrency;
5. Impact of social media on cybersecurity;
6. Whistleblower policies and implementation.

The BPF reached out to the community to solicit input on how to mitigate these risks. The non-exhaustive list of policy suggestions in the BPF output document reflects the thoughts and experiences of many contributors. Policy makers are invited to use this source as an inspiration when facing cybersecurity challenges, and to select ideas and further develop them within the context of their own organisations, fields or countries, and where relevant.

Stakeholder communities and their responsibilities

⁷ CENB I output document:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/connecting-and-enabling-the-next-billion-phase-i>

⁸ CENB II output document:

<https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/igf-2016-policy-options-for-connecting-and-enabling-the-next-billions-phase-ii>

Cyber issues have become complex and impact across society and economy, what makes siloed responses increasingly inadequate to mediate cybersecurity issues. All stakeholders bear responsibilities for cybersecurity and cyber hygiene, and have their specific competencies and experience. Multistakeholder discussion, cross-stakeholder group cooperation, and joint action, are indispensable to confront current and future challenges, and to avoid that initiatives by different stakeholders work counterproductive and fail to contribute to an increase of the overall level of security. The responsibilities of governments and international organisations, civil society, the technical community, the private sector and academia are addressed in the BPF document.

Areas to develop further stakeholder conversation

The BPF explored what areas and issues would benefit from further multistakeholder approach. Many issues are already being discussed and dealt with by one or more stakeholder groups in specific forums. Where this is the case, duplication and the creation new forums or platforms should be avoided. Instead stakeholders better look for opportunities to establish dialogue and cooperation between existing initiatives, or to join existing forums and help to further develop the multistakeholder dialogue.

The BPF, based on its community consultations, compiled the following list of cybersecurity areas that would benefit from further stakeholder conversation:

1. Fostering a culture of cybersecurity, developing of core values around cybersecurity.
 2. Development of internationally agreed cybersecurity norms.
 3. Internet of Things ecosystem security.
 4. Vulnerability of critical infrastructure and Internet resources.
 5. Acknowledge that security is an evolutionary process.
 6. DoS/DDoS attack, BGP/IP prefix hijacking and DNS abuse.
 7. Cybercrime
 8. State stability and peace in cyberspace.
 9. Ransomware.
 10. Lack of education and end user awareness/engagement.
 11. Forster international cooperation and legal principles for cybersecurity.
 12. Cognitive computing and Artificial Intelligence.
 13. Mobile networks and cybersecurity.
 14. Criminal justice aspects in cybersecurity policies.
 15. Extreme threats.
 16. Asymmetric use and access to the Internet.
 17. Anti-abuse initiatives.
-

Best Practice Forum on Local Content

Best Practice Forum on Local Content output document at

<https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/bpf-local-content-0> .

High Level Summary

Introduction

The 2017 IGF Best Practice Forum (BPF) on Local Content brought together experts and stakeholders to exchange experiences and best practices in stimulating the creation of locally relevant online content. Local content stimulates Internet uptake and usage and therefore helps to maximise the Internet's contribution to local development and towards achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The BPF on Local Content was part of the IGF intersessional work programme leading into the 2017 IGF Meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, on 18-21 December 2017. The BPF's open, bottom-up and collaborative process culminated in a dedicated workshop at the 2017 IGF meeting and the BPF output document.

Local content is a returning topic at the IGF and the creation of locally relevant content is considered to be a challenge that benefits from continued cooperation and coordinated effort of all stakeholders. In 2014 a BPF explored how to create an enabling environment for the development of local content and recommended to '*encourage regional cooperation and collaboration by organizing and sharing existing case studies of local content production and capacity building. A repository of such content would be a useful resource for Internet users*'.⁹ The 2017 BPF followed this advice and collected examples of successful projects to create local content, or initiatives that stimulate and support local developers or entrepreneurs to create content and services for the local population.

Locally relevant content as an engine for global Internet uptake

Hardly half of the global population is online and can reap the benefits of the Internet. Access and cost - the availability and the affordability of access to the Internet - are still a major challenge in many regions, with multiple barriers still to overcome. Continuous effort is needed at different levels - infrastructure, technology, regulatory, etc. - to bring the Internet to more places and more people.

Remarkably, despite the rapid growth of the Internet and the considerable improvement of access in some developing and remote areas, Internet uptake seems not to evolve at the same speed. A 2016 report noted that while 90% or more of the people in the Sub-Saharan African region nowadays lives within range of a mobile Internet signal, still only 20% or less of the

⁹<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/best-practice-forums/creating-an-enabling-environment-for-the-development-of-local-content/412-bpf-2014-outcome-document-creating-an-enabling-environment-for-the-development-of-local-content>

population is active online. The authors stated that ‘as a result of new investment in access infrastructure, including most notably mobile Internet networks, Internet availability now far outpaces adoption, and raises the question why adoption is lagging behind.’¹⁰ Evidence learns that improving access and affordability alone is not sufficient to motivate large groups of people to go online and actively use the Internet. They risk to miss opportunities, have no access to online knowledge, and cannot participate in the (local) online market.

People choose to go online because they expect the Internet to be useful and interesting. In other words, what the Internet brings, its content and services, must be relevant and useful from their perspective and meet their expectations, whether they are looking for information, amusement, or helpful tools for their business, study, or hobbies, or to keep in touch with family and friends. The availability of locally relevant content and services that answer to this demand is an important driver for Internet uptake and growth. The lack of relevant content can explain the lack of interest to go online and the slow Internet uptake in regions where access and affordability recently improved.

Locally Relevant Content, understood by and useful for the local user

The local Internet, and in extension the local digital economy, can only develop if it offers content and services that are relevant for the local Internet user. There are several reasons why much of the international content and services already available in many countries worldwide might not be ‘relevant’ for new Internet users in developing or rural areas. The statement that content and services must meet local interest and demand, has multiple layers and can be addressed from a cultural, language, technical, or other perspective.

Online content must be in a language that is understood by the local population and deal with matter of local interest. It is estimated that globally more than half of the online content is written in English, a language understood by only 21% of the world’s population. 80% of all content is available in one of 10 languages (World Bank estimates). Language can also be a barrier at the national level. In many large countries, the local language that is spoken and used in parts of the country and in particular in rural areas, is different from the country’s official national language(s). Local users do not always sufficiently know or feel familiar in the official language.

Local content creators are best placed to understand what is relevant for their own community, and know the local language, customs and culture. Local entrepreneurs are well placed to target the local market with online services, and local developers are well aware of technical limitations.

The BPF collected, via a public call for input, examples from around the world of successful projects and initiatives to stimulate the creation of local content. They fed into the BPF discussions and reflected in BPF output document. Many contributors shared their experiences with what worked well, and pointed at obstacles and challenges.

¹⁰ ‘Promoting Content in Africa’, The Internet Society, August 2016.

Facilitating and stimulating the availability of Local Content creation

There are many factors that contribute to facilitating and encouraging the creation and distribution of locally relevant content including freedom of expression, intellectual property protection, appropriate privacy protections for users and creators, consumer protection, improved infrastructure to access, share and host content, secure payment platforms to ease monetization of content, etc.. There's also a need for learning and capacity building to improve digital literacy and provide potential and new users with the skills to consume and/or produce online content.

Stakeholder roles and opportunities for action

Throughout the BPF's discussions, opportunities for stakeholder action surfaced. All stakeholder groups bear responsibility and can contribute to an enabling environment in which the creation of locally relevant online content and online services is encouraged and barriers are removed. The BPF took a modest attempt in listing what actions different stakeholders are taking or could take. Governments, in their role of policy maker, can take initiatives to remove barriers and stimulate local content creation, but also act as content creator an important provider of online information and services for their citizens. In many regions and developing areas civil society and academic organisations take initiatives to promote and directly support the development of local content. The Internet technical community plays an active role in the further development of the Internet and it's rollout around the world, for example by supporting the creation of Internet exchange points. Many technical community organisations are also involved in projects and trainings to improve e-literacy, digital skills, etc.. The private sector, larger international and national companies as well as local SMEs, is an indispensable partner for the development of a local online digital market. Without their interest in doing business online, there will be no supply of content, services of good to trade online.

Next steps

It is important that all stakeholders continue to be involved in discussions on local content creation, seek opportunities for stakeholder action and explore possibilities for cooperation between stakeholders at different levels.

Best Practice Forum on Gender and Access

Best Practice Forum on Gender and Access output document at

<https://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/bpf-gender-and-access-1> .

High level summary

Introduction

The BPF Gender was launched in 2015. The focus of this first intersessional activity dedicated to gender was online abuse and gender-based violence. In May 2016, at the first open consultations and MAG meeting of the IGF in Geneva, Switzerland the need was stressed for continuing to dedicate intersessional efforts to the study of gender-related challenges where the Internet is concerned.

Over the past three years, the IGF's Best Practice Forum (BPF) on Gender has been investigating various challenges pertinent to women's ability to access and use the Internet.

In December 2015, the BPF Gender 2015 published an extensive report on its findings and work on online abuse and gender-based violence¹¹. This report was produced as a reflection of this open, iterative and bottom-up process in which people from diverse regions and stakeholder groups. At IGF 2015 in João Pessoa, Brazil, the BPF furthermore hosted a 90-minute session led by BPF coordinator Jac Kee to discuss not only the BPF's draft findings and recommendations for further exploration, but also the ways in which the problem of online abuse and gender-based violence can continue to be addressed at both the IGF as a critical platform for multistakeholder engagement on key internet policy, governance and human rights issues, and in other policy discussion spaces.

In 2016, it looked at the barriers that women face in not only accessing but also using the Internet, along with mapping initiatives and methods that have been used in diverse jurisdictions to overcome these barriers (see the report [here](#))¹².

The BPF's work has indicated that much of the initiatives and literature available on women's ability to access and use the Internet tend to approach women as a homogenous group and fails to truly account for the unique way in which contexts and circumstances might impact women's ability to access and use the Internet. As a result, the BPF community in 2017 decided to look at the specific barriers faced by specific communities of women - including women with disabilities, refugee women, young women, elderly women, Queer women, women in rural areas, and indigenous women.

¹¹ <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/best-practice-forums/623-bpf-online-abuse-and-gbv-against-women/file>

¹² http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3406/437

The output paper is primarily driven by ground level research conducted by the various BPF rapporteurs in their area of work or interest. The survey¹³ inputs thus received from women working, representing or advocating for the various sub-groups brought out the specific needs and challenges in social and economic development facilitated by Internet access. It also detailed various initiatives at regional and national levels that are addressing some of these challenges. Connecting with the community, accessing information, and promoting educational opportunities were some of the key needs for the various sub-groups. The survey highlighted lack of infrastructure, insufficient local and relevant content, and social and cultural norms as major hindrances to Internet access for refugee women, indigenous women, queer women and young women. It also stressed the need for gender-focused policies and the sustainable grassroots-level initiatives to enhance inclusivity.

At the panel session organized at IGF 2017 in Geneva, the moderators and participants discussed specific challenges faced by the various women sub groups in question, that form a basis for the study too. The working session discussed the BPF's preliminary findings and recommendations for further exploration, and the ways in which stakeholders can support the work in addressing barriers to meaningful access faced by specific communities of women.

Each of the panelists shared their experience while working or belonging to their respective women sub groups. They highlighted various ICT challenges and the specific issues pertaining to the sub group they represented like Katie Drew of UNHCR who spoke of her interactions with refugee women in Uganda who had to trade ration supplies for access to internet or even phone chargers.

Several participants from the session eagerly shared their experiences too and related work, to further dialogue. A participant from Kosovo highlighted lack of local content as a key access issue for women from Africa. She also mentioned that low online security compelled them to use fake profiles online. Another participant from Mexico stressed on the importance of ICT education for women, special interest groups and more IG training and opportunities for women that digitally empower them, was the need of the hour. In terms of privilege and meaningful access to technology, the context in which women exist determines the effect technology will have in their lives.

Responses from some of the participants with STEM careers also showed that women in IT or tech still had to deal with male dominance at work, gender inequality and thus a need for a universal mentality shift was called for. "Gender bias in design of tech and in collection of data affects & exacerbates similar bias. Need to work in multistakeholder & multidisciplinary way & policies in place" said one of the participants. Issues of gender violence online and offline was also seen as a major detriment to women's access to internet, especially for younger women.

Some of the quotes below summarise the observations recorded:

¹³ <https://www.apc.org/limesurvey/index.php/783797/lang-en>

1. Refugee women

“Access to information, the sharing of knowledge is the sine qua non of empowerment and empowerment in one's own life. While keeping in mind a critical sense essential to avoid falling into the illusion of ‘miracle solutions’, we believe that the Internet and social networks represent in this respect an opportunity to exploit.”

- Anonymous respondent

1. Indigenous women

"[Access to the internet is important for women] to gain access to the outside world. Their windows to the outside world is largely through RTM (government run terrestrial television) – access to the internet opens them up to alternative information, on health, on education.”

- Respondent working with high risk and HIV positive rural and indigenous women in East Malaysia

Young women

"A women created a fake online profile because she feared the outcome if the community found out what her true opinions were around certain laws and practices."

- Anonymous respondent

4. Queer Women

“Queer women in Nigeria are mostly able to meet other queer women on online forums.”

- Respondent from Nigeria

“There is no information by mainstream channels about sexual diversity and human rights, so the internet has been the most popular, direct, and with great sources to access the information.”

The output paper summarising all the findings and sharing best practices in understanding and addressing the challenges faced by various women sub groups with respect to Internet access will be published in March.

