Submission #85

Personal information

Name Esmeralda Moscatelli

Organisation IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions)

Email address esmeralda.moscatelli@ifla.org

Country/region Netherlands

Gender Female

How would you define the stakeholder community or communities to which you belong? Civil society

Questions

1. What are your priorities for issues that should be addressed through the Internet Universality framework in each of these five categories?

Rights	IFLA believes that freedom of information and freedom of expression are fundamental human rights. Governments should uphold these rights as a priority, restricting them only where this is necessary and proportionate. Internet shutdowns and slowdowns should be rejected as a policy option. Governments and other stakeholders should take care not to allow unnecessary or unbalanced copyright laws, or limitations on political speech to place barriers on the Internet. Lobby nation states and regional entities to legislate for an Internet that supports human rights
Openness	IFLA supports an open Internet that does not deny users access to specific content. The Internet should be neutral, and no commercial interest should prioritize traffic over the web in a discriminatory fashion. Inform the public about the role commercial entities have in their access to content. Inform them about Internet technical structure and how to determine the openness of a connection.

Accessibility	IFLA believes that the Internet is a public service and as such it should be accessible by everyone. In this respect, a special attention should be devoted to an Internet accessible to people with disabilities and to the elderly to improve their quality of life. It will be important to focus both on physical access (and notably the existence of low/no-cost access as a gateway to the Internet for people who have previously not used it, as well as those for whom data packages, as well as relevant hardware, is out of reach), and on the skills necessary to get the most out of the Internet. With regard to measures of access around internet universality we would also suggest that affordability be included inside access – are there measures in place within a country to ensure that those of a low-socio-economic ranking can afford internet access? Is free access offered in communities through libraries or other services?
Multistakeholder participation	with a special emphasis on local and multi-language content. In the context of this consultation itself, regional/local participation should be emphasized and encouraged to set an example of inclusion of the voice of the global south. In many settings, however, New Zealand a case in point, librarries are working towards operating in a fully bicultural partnership with Maori, language on its own is not seen as a sign of multi-stakeholder participation, but instead as an issue of accessibility. Language enables minority groups to access a service, but does not clearly indicate participation. We would suggest that some measurement of diversity in internet governance for a region would more clearly indicate participation in the web. The multi stake holder indicator could be renamed to reflect this.
Cross-cutting indicators	there should be a strong focus on sustainability. It is essential that the future development of the Internet includes an emphasis on the role libraries, archives, and other organisations play in the preservation of resources to secure the historical, cultural, and social record. Addressing sustainability presents also an opportunity to not only acknowledge global inequalities and the unequal power relations in the way we record and view history but also to contribute to social transformation.

2. Are there are any existing indicators with which you are familiar that you think it would be useful to include in the ROAM indicators framework?

Rights	Number, scope and duration of certified Internet shutdowns and slowdowns (such as that run by AccessNow). Prevalence of laws which potentially criminalise speech online, and recorded incidence of prosecution and other persecution linked to online activities (Freedom House, work on Positive Peace by the Institute for Economics and Peace. Laws or regulations regarding information intermediaries (eg earlier this year Italy talked about regulating fake news)
Openness	Initial civil society-led work on monitoring net neutrality. Number of online works published with CC licences (CC). Number of OA publications (various sources). Extent of national open access mandates/policies for publicly-funded research (ROARmap should have this data already)

Accessibility	Numbers of people accessing the Internet at libraries, as well as share of libraries with Internet connections (statistics being collected by IFLA). Indicators of digital skills (such as use of productivity-enhancing tools) (ITU) o Indicators of trust in the Internet (such as those used by the OECD). Indicators of digital literacy, for example based on the OECD's work on digital problem solving for PISA, or through work based on the UNESCO Guideline for the Assessment of Media and Information Literacy, or initiatives such as the DQ Institute in Singapore. Proportion of websites which comply with web standards for people with disabilities. Cost of broadband internet connection (A4AI), perhaps also connection speeds? Proportion of content in local languages
Multistakeholder participation	EDRI – European Digital Rights – association (advocacy group) of civil and human rights organisations from across Europe which goal is to defend rights and freedoms in the digital environment. COMMUNIA – International association which advocates for expansion of the public domain and increase access to and reuse of culture and knowledge, they also limit the scope of exclusive copyright to sensible proportions that don't place unnecessary restriction on access and use
Cross-cutting indicators	

3. What do you think are the most important gaps in data/evidence required for monitoring Internet Universality and the ROAM principles? What approaches do you think could help to address these in your country, region or area of work?

Rights	The most important gaps in data/evidence for monitoring Internet and the "human rights" principle, it is that human rights for all remain a normative argument – i.e. they exist but are not implemented. In many countries human rights, including freedom of expression and freedom of access to information (notably online) are violated daily. It remains very hard to gather statistically sound evidence, other than around the lack of formal legal protection for rights, or direct infringement of the law. This is not a call to inaction. The suggestion would be to enhance the gathering of evidence and data when available by maintaining a watchful eye on the use of Internet and report when infringements occur.
Openness	From a technical point of view, for example, standards enhance our ability to go where we want when we want online. The formal uptake of standards could provide a useful starting point here. Legislation for net neutrality (including against zero rating practices) could provide another useful indicator, but again legislation is not necessarily evidence of effective implementation. In legal terms, the shift from physical to digital media as the main way of accessing scientific knowledge has opened the way to the Open Access movement. Indicators of the share of research articles and monographs published open access, and the adoption of policies by governments and research funders, would provide a useful indicator of whether some of the most valuable sources of information that exist online are accessible for all. At the same time, digital tools have turned research publications from goods (books) into services (access to a server), with a host of new means of controlling what users can do

Accessibility	Many of the indicators mentioned above tend to be purely based on survey data, raising questions about how to upscale them and so provide the granularity necessary to look at links with different socio-economic characteristics. These will be critical to assessing how effective the different dimensions of Internet universality genuinely are.
Multistakeholder participation	the question remains broad and not necessarily easily measured. A broader focus on political participation, building on indicators of political engagement and feeling of empowerment, as well as the existence of civil society consultation mechanisms.
Cross-cutting indicators	o Share of websites that are preserved o Prevalence of digital preservation policies among national libraries, archives, high profile publishers and other information producers. Informal, survey-based information does exist (for example for government documents), but of course is not necessarily in place nationally.

4. What experience or views do you have of indicators relating to the Internet which are concerned with gender and with children and young people?

• Young people and gender inequality on the net are important issues from the human rights perspective that libraries take. They are also issues with important spill-overs – gender is often understood as being only about women's needs, rather than about the unequal social relationships between women and men that are invested with power. These result in less effective policies, institutions and processes and mean that women's potential of these to contribute to social change is unused.

For example, the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) recently reported that global Internet user gender gap grew from 11% in 2013 to 12% in 2016. The gap., continues the report, remains large in the world's Least Developed Countries with the regional, largest gender gap is in Africa (23%) and smallest in the Americas (2%) ITU reported that there is an urban-rural divide related to the gender gap in Internet use Age is also a factor in the digital gender gap. According to the ITU, the Gender Digital Divide presents real challenges for the tech industry and for development practitioners, but also huge potential for new growth markets. Despite the great work the ITU performs, is this the right type of indicator we need to consult? Should we focus on growing markets or focusing and assessing what legal frameworks exist that may enable or inhibit broader gender (not only women) equality in a country? It is the matter of gender imbalance on the Internet a human right or an economic problem? The approach to determine gender indicators should be holistic: multi sectoral, systematic, comprehensive and sustainable and it should include policy, legislative and programmatic intervention at all levels. A great resource is found here: http://www.bridge.ids.ac.uk/. • For children and young adult, the situation is somewhat similar. Children's rights are firstly human rights and they should be treated as such. In the case of young adults and children an important indicator pertains to their online safety and security. Exploitation is a problem, as is exposure to harmful content online. There are many initiatives aimed at helping young people stay safe online, and there are indicators concerned with young people's safety online other some general studies at https://www.nspcc.org.uk/

5. How do you think you might use the indicator framework for Internet Universality once it has been developed?

• As an international federation of libraries and institutions, IFLA will use its extensive network to promote the framework among its members at the local, regional and national level. Its release will be publicized on IFLA website and a toolkit could be created to share the principles governing the net and a road map for future advocacy programs. Additionally, IFLA is active in promoting the UN SDGs through the Development and Access to Information report

(DA2I), which highlights the importance of public access in libraries. Thus, the indicator framework could provide both a useful tool for raising awareness, support our own work in making the case for libraries and could be employed to update the report in the upcoming years.

6. How do you think that other stakeholders might use the framework?

• They might use the report for advocacy purpose and/or as a baseline to further their research and analysis regarding Internet indicators. They may be able to use it to hold governments to account. Those with the capacity could look at the relationships between different pillars to understand how to get the right policy-mix.
• They might use it as a foundation for implementation educative resources and forming events that rise awareness in the field of Internet indicators

7. Please add any other comments that you think will be helpful to UNESCO in developing the indicators framework.

8. Please upload any documents that you think will be helpful here.