Survey on national and regional IGF initiatives

Sharing information about the organizing and planning processes of national and regional IGF initiatives
SURVEY METHODOLOGY

• At the time of the survey, there were 13 regional and 30 national IGF initiatives that are officially recognized by the IGF.

• Online invitational survey, distributed to coordinators of national and regional IGF initiatives (N/RIs) via the IGF Secretariat-maintained mailing list.

• Response rate:
  • Four regional initiatives (30%) responded.
  • Nineteen national initiatives (70%) responded.

The complete list of N/RIs can be found at the IGF website.
The chart illustrates the world geographical distribution of all 23 survey responses received.
HOW ARE THE N/RIs HOSTED?

Initiatives were asked (Q7 in the survey) to explain how they are hosted. A variety of models were identified, including:

• Many initiatives indicated that their multistakeholder organizing group acts as host.
• Some initiatives mentioned that they have a Secretariat in place.
  • Where a Secretariat exists, it is hosted by a governmental entity or by a private company (such as a ccTLD registry).
  • In other cases, the Secretariat is independent.
• One regional initiative indicated that it is hosted by an intergovernmental organization.
• Other examples included initiatives hosted in government/private company partnership.
• Additionally, some initiatives indicated that their annual meetings are hosted by different entities (universities, foundations, NGOs) which are selected annually after a public call.
• It is clear that there is no one size fits all model for national and regional IGF initiatives.
IGF initiatives were asked to indicate how they are funded. Several options were provided, and initiatives were able to select a combination of sources:

a) mostly by the official host of the annual meeting.

b) by a multitude of sponsors, through voluntary financial contributions.

c) through a combination of voluntary financial contributions and in-kind support from both the host of the annual meeting and other sponsor.

d) from institutional partners.
• 80% of the responding initiatives indicated their financial funders. A breakdown of such funders, by stakeholder group, is presented in the chart above.
• 84% of the responding initiatives also indicated their in-kind funders.
• Some initiatives also listed the type of in-kind support they receive. Some examples include: venue for the meeting, catering, hosting of online content (e.g. website), webstreaming, Internet connection, remote participation platforms.
N/RIs FUNDING

Q9. Publication of the budget

- 44% of initiatives responded that they do publish their budget;
- 56% answered that they do not publish a budget.
Thirty-five (35) per cent of responding initiatives indicated they do not publish the sources of financial sponsorship.

Twenty-six (26) per cent of responding initiatives showed they have published or intend to publish the sources of financial sponsorship, but without the amounts provided.

Seventeen (17) per cent indicated that they have published or intend to publish the sources of financial sponsorship with the amounts provided.

NOTE: these questions were not compulsory, and some initiatives that filled in the survey did not respond to them.
A majority of the responding IGF initiatives (65%) indicated that they use a steering group or committee as their organizational structure for the planning process. Two initiatives (one regional and one national) indicated that they employ other organizational structures, such as contracted organizing support, or consultant/advisor/technical support, etc. There are cases where more than one structure is used.

22% of the initiatives use a programme committee, while a logistical committee/team is characteristic for 26% of the respondents.
Most initiatives (20) 87% of all respondents) indicated that they require a multistakeholder composition for the various committees used for their planning processes; these committees therefore include representatives the various stakeholder groups (civil society, technical community, private sector, government, and, in some cases, intergovernmental organisations).

The three (3) initiatives that do not have a formal requirement for the organizational structure to be multistakeholder nevertheless encourage the participation of all stakeholder groups in their planning process and reach out to them to ensure that they get involved.
The initiatives were asked (Q21) to identify if they have a stated priority to include women, youth and persons with disabilities in their organizational structure and planning process. The charts above illustrate the results collected from the survey responses.
When asked to indicate how much time they spend on the planning process, most initiatives indicated over five months (35% 5-6 months and 43% more than 6 months).

Four (4) initiatives (18% of the respondents) spend between 1-2 months on the planning process, while one initiative allocates 3-4 months to this process.
87% answered they conduct online or other consultation on the programme of their annual event;
13% of the answers were unclear.
IGF initiatives were requested to indicate the modalities they use for capturing and documenting the proceedings of their annual meetings.

- The most widespread modality (as indicated by 91% of all responding initiatives) is written reports by rapporteurs.
- Many initiatives also webcast their meetings (65%) and use social media (65%). Twitter and Facebook appear to be the most used social media tools.
- Only 30% of all respondents indicated that they use transcription for their meetings.
- There were also indications of other modalities, such as final reports of the annual meeting and collaborative notes from sessions, written by the community/participants.
The chart above shows the number of initiatives that indicated use of social media (by platform):

- The initiatives mostly use Facebook (21) and Twitter (18) platforms.
- Only one initiative indicated that it uses the Linkedin platform.
EVENT OVERVIEW

Streaming platforms used

- Webex: 10
- YouTube: 0
- Website livestreaming: 2
- Adobe Connect: 0
- Did not answer: 6
The largest percentage of responding initiatives (39%) have a one day long event, followed by two day event (35%), three day event (22%), while one initiative indicated having an event of less than a day.

Among the four responding regional IGF initiatives, one of them is a three day event, two are two day events, and one is a one day event. The following chart illustrates the relation between answers.
When asked whether they track the stakeholder groups among participants at their annual event, most of the responding initiatives (74%) said that they do.

Sixty-five percent (65%) of responding IGF initiatives indicated that they track women and youth among participants in their annual events.

Some initiatives (39%) also offer their participants the option to indicate in the registration form whether they have any needs or disability. Many initiatives, however, commented that they do plan to keep track of participants with special needs for their future events.
Most IGF initiatives (16) that responded to the survey indicated that their most recent annual event had up to 250 participants.

The seven initiatives that had between 251 and over 500 participants included both national and regional initiatives; for example, among the four initiatives that had over 500 participants, two are regional and two national.
Answering on the question (Q22b) regarding the stakeholders group breakdown, it is concluded that most of the initiatives have most participants form the sector of government (9) and private sector (8). The smallest number of participants are coming from international organization and academical and technical community (2).
EVENT OVERVIEW

Q24 b) and c). Number of sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plenary sessions</th>
<th>Break-out sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVENT OVERVIEW

Q24. Type of sessions

- 100% of initiatives have an opening session
- 96% have plenary sessions
  - Average number of plenary sessions: 5.2
  - Note events spanning multiple days have many more plenary sessions
- 65% have breakout sessions
  - Average number of breakout sessions: 7.3
  - Note events with greater attendance (200+) typically have more breakout sessions.
Topics discussed in workshops (Q25):

- Net neutrality
- Content development
- Internet governance
- Human rights and freedom of expression
- E-commerce
- Access
- Online security and cybercrime
- New media
- Internet of Things
- Open government
- Critical Internet resources
- Privacy
- Intellectual property rights and copyright
EVENT OVERVIEW

Q27. Overarching theme or sub-themes from IGF

- Seventy-four (74) percent of responding initiatives included the overarching theme or sub-themes from the IGF2015 in their event.
- The IGF2015 themes/sub-themes most commonly discussed at N/RI events included:
  - Policies enabling Access
  - Content Creation, Dissemination and Use
  - Internet as engine for growth & development
  - Enhancing Digital Trust
  - Internet and Human Right
  - Critical Internet Resources
Q26. Outcome or output statements/messages

Most IGF initiatives (83%) had outcome/output statements/messages resulting from their annual event.
ENGAGEMENT WITH IGF

- 92 per cent of respondents actively follow the IGF’s planning and activities (Q30.)
- 64 per cent of respondents have MAG members in their region/country that are engaged in their initiative (Q31a).
- 100 per cent of respondents believe the work of the IGF is relevant to their region & initiative (Q31).
ENGAGEMENT WITH IGF

60 per cent of respondents attend MAG meetings in-person or virtually (Q31b) (chart right)

72 per cent of respondents have participated in past N/RI Substantive Sessions (Q33). Average number of sessions in the past 5 years: 3.5. (Chart below).

92 per cent indicated they would attend informal calls and sessions of N/RIs (Q31c) (chart above).
INTERSESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Q34-36. Inter-sessional activities

- 78% of responding initiatives indicated they conduct intersessional activities (Q34).
- 35% of initiatives participate in or contribute to the IGF's 2015 inter-sessional activities (Q35).
- 17% of initiatives contribute to the work of IGF Dynamic Coalitions;
- 43% have made a submission to the IGF inter-sessional work on Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion (Q36a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having Inter-sessional activities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to IGF 2015 inter-sessional activities</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to DCs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to &quot;Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion&quot;</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the major challenges for your N/RI? (Q37)
N/RIs ANNUAL EVENTS IN 2016

The initiatives were asked (Q38) to indicate if they plan to organize a national/regional IGF in the next year. According to the collected answers:

- the majority of them are planning to organize the event.
- In the time of answering the this question (September/October 2015), 24% of all the responses indicate that they don’t have final decision yet.