

WS 99 - Multicultural and Multistakeholder Capacity Building

Session Title	WS Multicultural and Multistakeholder Capacity Building
Date	8 December 2016
Time	15:00 - 16:30
Session Organizer	<p>Co-Organizers</p> <p>Dustin Phillips – ICANNWiki</p> <p>Adrián Carballo - CCAT LAT Centro de Capacitación para América Latina y el Caribe</p> <p>Julio César Vega Gómez - AMIPCI Asociación Mexicana de Internet</p> <p>Olga Cavalli - Internet Society Argentina Chapter – South School on Internet Governance</p>
Chair/Moderator	Olga Cavalli – Dustin Philips
Rapporteur/Notetaker	Anahi Menendez
List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations	<p>Lee Hibbard – Council of Europe</p> <p>Julio César Vega Gómez – Asociación Internet MSX (Amipci)</p> <p>Jackie Treiber – ICANNWiki</p> <p>Dustin Philipps – ICANNWiki</p> <p>Alfredo Reyes Krafft – Lexis</p> <p>Belisario Contreras – OAS – CICTE</p> <p>Renata Aquino Ribeiro – Universidad de Paraiba</p> <p>Mikhail Komarov – Moscow Higher School of Economics</p>
Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):	<p>To create a true multistakeholder model that is truly inclusive, subject matter needs to be built from the bottom-up.</p> <p>Language is still a barrier a participation and thus limits the multiculturalism and multilingualism, which should be an inherent part of any true multistakeholder process.</p> <p>While there are tools and opportunities available to increase participation in Internet governance debate space and build a more balanced and diverse model, there are still a lot of improvements that we can work on to make increase participation for those who would otherwise not be able to join.</p>

<p>If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each Presentation</p>	<p>No presentations.</p>
<p>Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session: (3 paragraphs)</p>	<p>The session began with moderators setting the scene, by describing the increase in capacity building initiatives since the first IGF in 2016, including national and regional IGFs, Schools on Internet Governance and other dialogue spaces. In this session the discussion examined the success of these initiatives through shared experiences and outcomes. In this workshop the barometer of success was the effectiveness of these workshops in capacity building in a way that accurately reflects the multistakeholder model, especially in terms of multiculturalism and multilingualism.</p> <p>The discussion began by discussing the balance of stakeholders in these capacity spaces. Panelists shared their experiences in bringing in a diverse and balanced set of stakeholders. The barriers to this included, demonstrating relevance, the need for outreach and economic barriers. Demonstrating the relevance of Internet governance and in particular debate space is a reflection of the content. Panelists used this as an example of why it is important to cover a variety of topics and invite a diverse set of presenters and speakers. To address the outreach issue, panelists discussed the importance of the bottom-up approach. Building subject matter from the bottom up not only ensures that content is relevant to a variety of stakeholders, but it is also engaging and encourages people to take part in the process.</p> <p>The panel ended with a lightning round to address the issue of economic barriers, with each panelists answering a simple set of questions: Free or Paid? Remote or in-person? There were a varying degree of responses, on both questions. Some panelists suggested that paying a small fee would make the participants value the time more, but most believed that free participation is the best way forward. However, it was mentioned that free is not really free, because travel and accommodation costs are beyond the means of many. This led to panel raising the importance of fellowship programs and the value that they bring by giving a voice to those who would otherwise not be able to attend the events in person. This also brought up the effectiveness of participating remotely. Most panelists agreed that the remote participation tools are valuable and make Internet governance spaces more inclusive, but it was acknowledged that it is not equal to on-site participation</p>

<p>Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways: (3 paragraphs)</p>	<p>After I lively discussion, we had several audience members ask questions and raise issues. One major issue brought up by the audience was that while discussing a topic about multiculturalism and multilingualism, the session in our room was not translated and how this is a barrier to the type of participation that we are seeking.</p> <p>Another extremely relevant question, asked about creating a national IGF and how to identify the content of the forum in a way that is engaging and inclusive. There were a variety of suggestions, but the common denominator was that the subject matter needs to be built in a bottom-up fashion.</p> <p>Finally, in order to keep Internet governance free and open, the majority of panelists agreed that the forums themselves must remain free and open. However, some panelists went even further to say that there needs to be an emphasis on fellowships and scholarships that bring more voices to the discussion and build capacity for a more diverse and inclusive multistakeholder body.</p>
---	--