Mapping multistakeholder participation in internet governance from an African perspective

Results of a survey on African Internet Governance
Survey Sample
High level of education of African IG stakeholders

- 41 respondents from three mailing lists of individuals involved in IG in Africa at different levels

**Gender (%)**
- Male: 71%
- Female: 29%

**Highest level of school completed (%)**
- None: 2.4%
- Primary: 14.6%
- Secondary: 27%
- Tertiary: diploma/certificate: 19.5%
- Tertiary: BSc/BA: 37%
- Tertiary: Masters: 37%
- Tertiary: PhD: 19.5%
Survey Sample
National IGF on the rise, boosted by NGOs?

- Respondents well spread all over African continent
Organisations, forums and processes

Predominance of African IGF (national and regional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisations/Forums/Processes</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International org</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agency/org</td>
<td>WGIG; WSIS; WCIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>AFRALO; ICANN47 Durban; NPOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGF</td>
<td>NICTWG Malawi; AfiGF; IGF Central Africa; IGF DRC; AISI; Arabe IGF; SAIGF; Wester Africa IGC; Burkina IGF; KIGF; Sierra Leone IGF; IGF Gambia; EAIGF; AIGF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt/Regulatory agency</td>
<td>AUC; COMESA; other RECs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think tanks/academy/research/education</td>
<td>Research ICT Africa; AfriSIG; Botho University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs/Networks</td>
<td>TakingITGlobal; APC; Botswana Information Technology Society; VLIR-UOS; AfiICTA; KICTAnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISOC</td>
<td>ISOC SN; ISOC KE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical community</td>
<td>SADC IXP; ISPA; WAPA; AfriNIC; W3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Google</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most relevant IG issues for Africa

Access and Internet4D on top of priority list

- Access: 65%
- Internet for development: 58%
- Internet content: 48%
- Cyber-security: 48%
- IP protection: 20%
- Protection of human rights: 18%
- Surveillance/privacy: 13%
- Gender and equality: 10%
- IP addresses DNS ANS policy: 5%
- Internet neutrality: 3%
Most effective org, forums or processes in representing IG issues from an African perspective (%)

- African IGF: 58%
- Global IGF: 32%
- National IGF: 32%
- ICANN: 24%
- ISOC AC: 16%
- AU: 16%
- ITU: 13%
- AfriNIC: 13%
- UNECA: 5.3%
Factors preventing effective participation to IG processes and debates

- Lack of financial resources: 87%
- Not aware of dates and venues: 26%
- General disinterest: 21%
- Lack of technical skills: 18%
- IG debates are a waste of time: 8%
- Internet issues are not important: 5%
Effectiveness in terms of providing information, data or research on internet policy

National Govt
AU
UNECA
ITU
ICANN
ISOC
Effectiveness in terms of providing a platform to discuss data or research on internet policy

African Development Forum
National IGF
WSIS
Sub-Regional IGF
African IGF
Global IGF
Comments on data or research on internet policy

- “There is no coordinated approach nationally or within countries in SADC region in providing data or research on internet policy” (Government, Malawi)

- “No cohesion amongst all these groups” (Private sector)

- “Most of the processes are not substantiated by facts, data. Most of the presentations are fictional or imageries” (Academic org, Cameroon)

- “More needs to be done in respect to developing concrete outcomes from these meetings” (ISOC)
Effectiveness in advocating for internet rights

“The only sub-regional IGF I have participated was a formal government meeting opened up only to invited organisations with no remote participation or engagement” (Think tank)

“These organisations are really in great potential area to make it work for the providers and consumers of the internet” (ISOC)
Effectiveness to develop internet technical standards and protocols

“Usually the RIR provides a commendable job to allow companies to get access and technical help on internet issues” (Government, Malawi)
Comments on effectiveness of organisations to develop standards and protocols

“Some of the organisations such as IETF and IAB are highly effective since they bring together engineers from different parts of the world and harness their contribution in developing a global internet” (ISOC, AfTLD)
Effectiveness to regulate internet content or to provide technical support on internet content regulation

“IT is not an issue that has really been brought out properly in a structured manner in Africa, to me it seems other areas are of more importance” (NGO, international)
Effectiveness in providing a platform to discuss and learn about internet content regulation

“During the only sub-regional IGF I participated there was little discussion on content regulation” (Think tank)
Effectiveness to regulate cybersecurity or to provide technical support on it

“State/governments are better placed to tackle cyber-crime issues. But cooperation is needed among them” (Academic org)
Effectiveness to discuss and learn on cyber-security

“At Regional and National level more players need to come in to support this process, working with national governments” (NGO, international)
Effectiveness in developing and implementing internet for development programmes and projects

“The idea is to try to get what is done globally to reach national levels properly on IG for D, this can only be done through the efforts of all stakeholders working together at a national level” (NGO, international)
Effectiveness to discuss and learn about internet for development programmes and projects

- National IGF
- Sub-Regional IGF
- African IGF
- Global IGF

Highly ineffective
Highly Effective
Most effective on making decision or reaching an agreement in the area of internet governance in which they have a mandate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Govt</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIR</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Association of Regulators</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRA</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNECA</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other UN agency</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effectiveness on making decision or reaching an agreement in the area of internet governance

- “While ITU and ICANN are most effective on acting on their mandate yet they have not been able to build a consensus on Internet Governance which remains at an impasse” (Think tank)

- “Internet governance should start at home. AU should copy what the EU has achieved in creating a power base to use as leverage negotiation” (Academic org)

- “ITU can make decisions that will make spectrum affordable. ICANN has been implementing Regional Strategies to encourage greater participation in the global IG Debate. AfriNIC has been at the forefront of supporting the IG debate on the inert and promoting participation of Africans through the A*, Net Mundial and Africa Internet Summit. The AU plays a crucial role of educating Ministers and African leaders on the importance of IG in their nations” (ISOC, AfTLD)
What you think multistakeholder means?

- “Bring stakeholders together to participate in the dialogue, decision making, and implementation of solutions to common problems or goals” (Government, Malawi)

- “Complex problems require innovative solutions. Such solutions are created when diverse stakeholders are able to meet, share experiences, learn together and contribute to decisions. Ultimate success then lies in developing the collective commitment and capacity to turn ideas and plans into action. This can be achieved through multi-stakeholder processes (MSPs) and social learning” (NGO, DRC)

- “Multistakeholderism in the Internet Governance should have meant that the debate should not remain between public and private organisations directly related to information technology, telecommunications, Internet, ICT but really go beyond” (ISOC SN)

- “Multistakeholderism means increased accountability, transparency and accessibility to decisions taken in the public domain” (Think tank)
What you think multistakeholder means? cont.

- “Bottom up process in which users, industries, business and government are engaged in the search of better ways to serve people” (Academic org)

- “All players participate and are equally represented and have equal decision making power in the IG deliberations” (ISOC Uganda)

- “All the persons or organisations who have the legitimacy or the right to make policies regarding internet governance have their words to say and their point of view to tell” (Government, Cote d’Ivoire)

- “It is appropriate when applied with the necessary caution, as multi-stakeholders in the final analysis is subject to the rules of their national governments and not as it is currently being advocated only subject to USA rules” (International org)

- “All stakeholders are involved in discussion prior to any decision making, and this at the national, regional, continental or global level” (NGO, Burundi)
To what extent is multistakeholderism practised, feasible or applicable in existing (internet) governance and policy structures in Africa?

‣ “The failure of many African countries to meet the democratic thresholds of representation and participation make multistakeholder engagement unfeasible or impossible at the national level, which translates in lopsided participation at the international level (unless sovereign member state representation is circumvented in some way)” (Think tank)

‣ “Presently there is hardly any and you find a few select groups making assumptions for a whole many” (Multilateral org)
What improvements are needed to strengthen Africa’s internet governance ecosystem and make multistakeholderism work more effectively?

- “Commitment to adopting fundamental human rights principles of equality, freedom of expression and association, public participation in decision-making at the national level, and then ensuring these are protected and practiced online” (Think tank)

- “Should African governments agree to finance their own development programs for internet governance on the continent” (ISOC SN)

- “Capacity building to understand IG concepts not only to allow for increase in knowledge of these concepts but also to equip Africans in participating in international IG debates and also understand how to relate them to the Africa context” (ISOC Uganda)
What improvements are needed to strengthen Africa’s internet governance ecosystem and make multistakeholderism work more effectively?

- “There is need to reach out to African governments and ensure they participate effectively in the Internet Governance debate. Current focus is on civil society, Internet users and Intergovernmental organisations. There is a need for awareness creation and more capacity building programs” (ISOC Kenya)

- “Political buy-in” (Multilateral org)
What is your vision with respect to multistakeholder processes and internet governance?

‣ “I think the prospects of creating effective, democratic, participatory governance arrangements are bleak without these first being addressed in non-digital world” (Think tank)

‣ “It should enhance democracy by making democratic processes more flexible and responsive, able to adjust to changing contexts, circumstances, technologies, impacted populations. People should be well informed on the current trends on global and national issues” (Government, Malawi)

‣ “We need to improve this concept in all exchange daily in different level of our activities between stakeholders” (NGO, DRC)

‣ “To get governments actually involved in the solution” (Private org, SA)