



POLICY OPTIONS FOR CONNECTING & ENABLING THE NEXT BILLION(S): PHASE II (2016 edition)

This is the final output resource from the second phase of an intersessional, multistakeholder and community-driven activity of the IGF aimed at investigating challenges and opportunities for addressing and overcoming barriers to meaningful Internet access, promoting meaningful access in diverse contexts and regions, and ensuring that meaningful access also supports the achievement of the UN sustainable development goals.

Phase I & II coordinator: Constance Bommelaer

Phase II editor: Anri van der Spuy

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
NOTES & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS	5
INTRODUCING THIS RESOURCE	6
CONTEXT: THE IGF'S INTERSESSIONAL PROGRAMME	6
<i>POLICY OPTIONS – 2015 AND 2016</i>	8
READING THIS RESOURCE	8
OBJECTIVES OF PHASE II	9
METHODOLOGY: PHASE II	10
POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS OF PHASE II	12
PART A: ACCESS AND THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS	13
THE SDGs	13
MEETING THE SDG 9-C TARGET OF UNIVERSAL ACCESS	14
CORE LESSONS FROM PHASE I: <i>POLICY OPTIONS FOR CONNECTING THE NEXT BILLION</i>	15
PHASE II: ENABLING THE NEXT BILLION(S) BY ENSURING <i>MEANINGFUL</i> ACCESS	17
HOW INTERNET CONNECTIVITY CAN GENERALLY SUPPORT THE SDGs	26
ENSURING INTERNET ACCESS ACTUALLY SUPPORTS THE SDGs	29
ACCESS AND THE SPECIFIC SDGs	30
PART B: LOCAL, NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SPECIFICITIES	52
INTRODUCTION	52
OVERVIEW: GAINING A COMPREHENSIVE UNDERSTANDING OF LOCAL CONTEXTS	53
ENSURING THAT ACCESS IS <i>MEANINGFUL</i>	60
PROMOTING TRUST AND SECURITY TO ENSURE MEANINGFUL ACCESS	65
ENHANCING MULTISTAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION	66
FURTHER RESEARCH AND SOME CONCERNS	67
PART C: CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS	69
PART D: APPENDICES	70
APPENDIX 1: ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND BACKGROUND READING	70
APPENDIX 2: FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT	76
APPENDIX 3: CALL FOR INPUT	81

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion is an IGF intersessional activity in its second year of running, and this resource is the final output of Phase II of this community-driven work. This publication is not only intended to be a useful and tangible resource for policymakers and other stakeholders, but also symbolises the IGF community's conviction that the need for multistakeholder collaboration towards expanding meaningful Internet access is a shared goal that remains at the core of Internet governance.

Over 60 written responses from 44 individual and other stakeholders (including organizations working on related topics) were received in consecutive rounds of input for Phase II (a full list of contributors can be found in [Part D](#) of this resource). These contributions were bolstered by various sessions on the theme held at IGF 2016, which took place between 6 and 9 December 2016 in Guadalajara, Mexico. These include a main session dedicated to the IGF's intersessional activities including this one; a main session focused on national and regional IGF initiatives and, among other things, contextual specificities where access is concerned; and a day-zero event organized by a variety of stakeholders working in the field of expanding access. The analysis provided in this resource aims to provide a reasonable and balanced reflection of these community events and other submissions; augmented with background literature recently published on related topics. The overall objective of this exercise is to deliver a useful output resource that would be reflective of general trends relevant to the challenge of connecting and enabling more Internet users.

Phase II of this initiative naturally builds on the foundations of the IGF community's work in 2015, including the lessons learnt during the initiative's first phase. This year's work strongly emphasises the need for not merely working towards expanding access, but also ensuring that such access is meaningful and pervasive. Keeping this in mind, the focus of the IGF's multistakeholder community in this year's work was two-fold: including the ways in which meaningful access can support the SDGs ([Part A](#)), and the local and regional specificities that need to be kept in mind when addressing connectivity concerns ([Part B](#)).

In [Part A](#) of this resource, lessons learnt by this initiative in 2015 are reviewed, followed by an examination of what meaningful access entails, the barriers to such access, current data limitations, and the significance of the means of gaining access (including an analysis of private versus public access). This part of the resource also investigates community networks as potentially useful ways

of enabling more meaningful and sustainable access through the active participation of local communities.

The remainder of [Part A](#) focuses on the ways in which increased access can support the UN's 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which was adopted in 2015. The resource recognises that for universal access to support the sustainable development goals (SDGs), it needs to be both universal and meaningful. The resource also provides a starting point for analysing the ways in which meaningful Internet access can support each of the 17 SDGs more specifically, including cases and stories from various contributors in a diversity of regions. While the examples indicate that there are a growing number of initiatives at local, regional, and global levels aimed at improving the quantity and quality of access, the resource also stresses the fact that much more needs to be done to ensure universal adoption that also serves to support the SDGs.

In [Part B](#) of the resource, themes that are relevant to and important for adapting, developing, and implementing policy options for connecting and enabling users at national, regional, and local levels are investigated. Factors, characteristics and/or lessons that were extracted from stakeholders' contributions to Phase II, as well as the ways in which these factors, characteristics and/or themes can inform local, national, and regional initiatives aimed at addressing connectivity, are discussed in this part of the resource.

Contributions reflected in [Part B](#) stress the importance of clearly establishing the demands, priorities, and unique needs of every location and community in a specific location when attempting to address connectivity challenges. Among other things, contributors point out the significance of terrain, measuring existing infrastructure, understanding the local market and general investment environment, promoting and ensuring trust and security, and enhancing multistakeholder collaboration in promoting better access solutions. Contributors also stress the need for further research to better understand local and regional specificities around access.

In [Part C](#), the final substantive part of the resource, a succinct overview of feedback received at a main session dedicated to intersessional activities at IGF 2016 is provided. The resource concludes with a brief summary of proposed next steps for the IGF's *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)*, including the need for further and continued research on how meaningful Internet access should and can support the SDGs, and detailed case studies of initiatives aimed at addressing access challenges in order to identify lessons relevant to diverse national and regional contexts.

Phase I & II coordinator: Constance Bommelaer; Phase II editor: Anri van der Spuy

NOTES & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Interpretation notes

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this resource do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The term ‘country’ as used in the text of this publication also refers, as appropriate, to territories and areas.

The designations ‘developed’ and ‘developing economies’ are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily imply a judgment about the stage reached by a particular country or area in the development process.

Mention of the name of any company, organization, product or website does not imply endorsement on the part of the United Nations.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to MAG volunteers who contributed to the development of Phase II’s framework document, including Julian Casasbuenas G., Wisdom Donkor, Alejandra Errasmuspe, Miguel Estrada, Renata Aquino Ribeiro, and Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimara. A further thank you to the volunteers who served on the initiative’s Editorial Working Group and contributed to reviewing various iterations of the resource output – including Sharada Srinivasan, Christopher Yoo, Julian Casasbuenas G., Wisdom Donkor, Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimara, Renata Aquino Ribeiro, Alejandra Errasmuspe, Carolyn Nguyen, and Arsène Tungali. A special thanks to Michael Oghia for his devoted editing and proofreading of this resource.

Thank you to all contributors, those who commented on various drafts of the output resource, as well as the audience, moderators, and panellists who participated in the main session on intersessional activities at IGF 2016 on 9 December 2016 in Guadalajara, Mexico. A complete list of all contributions can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this resource.

Lastly, putting this resource together would not have been possible without the assistance and guidance of Constance Bommelaer, substantive coordinator of Phase I and II of this initiative, as well as the IGF Secretariat team, particularly Brian Gutterman.

Anri van der Spuy, Editor

ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

3G	Third generation (wireless mobile telecommunications technology)
4G	Fourth generation (wireless mobile telecommunications technology)
A4AI	Alliance for Affordable Internet
AI	Artificial intelligence
APC	Association for Progressive Communications
APrIGF	Asia Pacific Regional Internet Governance Forum
BPF	Best Practice Forum (IGF)
Broadband Commission	Broadband Commission for Sustainable Development (UN)
ccTLD(s)	Country code top-level domain(s)
CCTV	Closed-circuit television
CN(s)	Community network(s)
CSTD	Commission on Science and Technology for Development (UN)
DC	Dynamic Coalition
DEF	Digital Empowerment Foundation
EuroDIG	Pan-European Dialogue on Internet Governance
FDI	Foreign direct investment
GDP	Gross domestic product
GeSI	Global e-Sustainability Initiative
GSMA	Groupe Speciale Mobile Association
ICANN	Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
ICT(s)	Information and communication technology/ies (ICTs)
IDN(s)	Internationalised domain name(s)
IEEE	Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
IGF	Internet Governance Forum
IGO	Intergovernmental organization
IoT	Internet of Things
ISOC	Internet Society
ISP	Internet service provider
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
IPv6	Internet Protocol version 6
ISOC	Internet Society
IXP(s)	Internet exchange point(s)
LDC(s)	Least developed country/ies
M2M	Machine-to-machine
M-platforms	Mobile platforms
MAG	Multistakeholder Advisory Group (IGF)
MDG(s)	Millennium Development Goal(s)
MLATs	Mutual legal assistance treaty/ies
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
NRI	National and Regional IGF initiatives
SEEDIG	South Eastern European Dialogue on Internet Governance
SDG(s)	Sustainable Development Goal(s)
SMS	Short message service
STEM	Science, technology, engineering and mathematics
UN	United Nations
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
USF(s)	Universal service fund(s)
Web Foundation	World Wide Web Foundation
WEF	World Economic Forum
WSIS	World Summit on the Information Society

INTRODUCING THIS RESOURCE

Context: the IGF's intersessional programme

The United Nations (UN) Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) working group on Internet Governance Forum (IGF) improvements called for the development of more tangible IGF outputs to 'enhance the impact of the IGF on global Internet governance and policy' (UN CSTD 2012:4).

The IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) and the IGF Secretariat consequently launched an intersessional programme in 2015 with the aim of extending and increasing the impact of other IGF activities, such as National and Regional IGF Initiatives (NRIs), Dynamic Coalitions (DCs), and Best Practice Forums (BPFs). To this extent, the ongoing programme *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)* is considered a unique opportunity for the IGF community to help address a complex challenge in a multistakeholder, bottom-up manner through the consideration of a diversity of perspectives.

The outputs from the IGF's community intersessional programme are intended to be dynamic resources and to evolve and grow over time. Working modalities for all intersessional activities include:

- The IGF Code of Conduct (2016)¹ has to be followed by all stakeholders² involved in IGF community activities;
- Community intersessional working groups have the freedom to define their own methodologies and working modalities, tailored to each group's specific needs and requirements;
- For each intersessional activity/working track, the community concerned is tasked with discussing and deciding on their respective working modalities in an open and transparent way using mailing lists and frequent virtual meetings; and
- Decisions on working modalities should reflect the support of participants of the respective activities and are also to be made in an inclusive and transparent manner.

¹ Available at: <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/aboutigf/igf-code-of-conduct>.

² The term 'stakeholder' refers to all individuals and organizations involved in or affected by Internet governance processes. The IGF officially recognizes the following stakeholder groups: the private sector, governments, intergovernmental organizations, civil society (including end users), the media, the technical community, academia, and youth.

Intersessional IGF initiatives such as *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)* furthermore aim to support the IGF's mandate as prescribed in paragraph 72 of the World Summit on the Information Society's (WSIS) Tunis Agenda for the Information Society (2005), and particularly the need to:

- Discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet;
- Facilitate discourse between bodies dealing with different cross-cutting international public policies regarding the Internet and discuss issues that do not fall within the scope of any existing body;
- Interface with appropriate intergovernmental organizations and other institutions on matters under their purview;
- Facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and in this regard make full use of the expertise of the academic, scientific and technical communities;
- Advise all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world;
- Strengthen and enhance the engagement of stakeholders in existing and/or future Internet governance mechanisms, particularly those from developing countries;
- Identify emerging issues, bring them to the attention of the relevant bodies and the general public, and, where appropriate, make recommendations;
- Help to find solutions to the issues arising from the use and misuse of the Internet, of particular concern to everyday users.

The IGF also aims to provide a unique platform for this collaborative intersessional work in order to collect the views of the broader Internet governance community on the topic of connectivity and meaningful access, and organize the information received in a holistic framework. The IGF strives in all of its work to provide a neutral and open platform that ensures that all interested parties in the multistakeholder Internet governance community have multiple opportunities to contribute in a bottom-up fashion.

This work recognises that increasing Internet access is a shared goal that is at the core of Internet governance, and many policy issues contribute to the enabling environment for improved access.

Policy Options – 2015 and 2016

In 2015, more than 70 submissions contributed to the development of a set of *Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion – Phase I*,³ which was presented at the 10th global IGF in João Pessoa, Brazil. Phase I of this initiative mapped⁴ the multifaceted nature of the challenge of increasing connectivity, and demonstrated how stakeholders tend to approach the issue from diverse and unique perspectives (the outcomes of Phase I are described in more detail in [Part A](#) below). The process of developing Phase I also illustrated that when stakeholders share experiences to identify obstacles, solutions and strategies, innovative solutions to and collaborative partnerships addressing multi-dimensional connectivity challenges may be encouraged and found (IGF, 2015).

The IGF's MAG decided in April 2016 to build upon and further develop the *Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion* programme. During the initial stages of this process, it was agreed to expand the scope and title of this initiative to better encompass some of the lessons learnt in 2015, including the notion that access is not merely about technical access, but also extends to enabling and empowering users. It was further agreed to enable a broader interpretation of 'the next billion' to recognise the fact that there are more than 3.9 billion people still offline (c.f., Broadband Commission, 2016a). Because many of the unconnected tend to be disproportionately poor, rural, elderly, female or disabled, the term should also be construed to include any persons who are not *meaningfully* connected to the Internet – in other words, users who are only barely connected (a notion which is discussed in more detail in [Part A](#) below).

As a result, the initiative is henceforth referred to and known as the IGF *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)*, and the work done in 2016 was conducted under Phase II of this ongoing initiative.

Using this resource

³ The submissions can be viewed online: IGF (2015). *List of Contributors*. Available at: <http://intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/connecting-and-enabling-the-next-billion-phase-i> [Accessed 22 September 2016].

⁴ The outcome report can be viewed online: IGF (2015). *Outcome documents: Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion*. Available at: <http://intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/connecting-and-enabling-the-next-billion-phase-i>. [Accessed 22 September 2016].

[Part A](#) of this *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)* resource explores the relationship between meaningful access and the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).⁵ It provides a brief summary of key lessons learnt from Phase I of this initiative, as stakeholders' understanding of what 'meaningful access' is should build on the outcomes of Phase I, conducted in 2015. It investigates stakeholders' understanding, as gleaned from contributions to Phase II, of the barriers to access – as gleaned from contributions to Phase II – in order to ascertain how stakeholders can ensure that access is meaningful and thus able to not only connect, but to also *enable* the next billion(s). Having investigated stakeholders' understanding of meaningful access, the rest of [Part A](#) investigates both general and specific ways in which information and communication technologies (ICTs) and connectivity can support the SDGs.

Given stakeholders' views that ICTs and the Internet are paramount to sustainable development (see the rest of [Part A](#) for these views), it is furthermore critical that policy options and strategies be tailored to local needs and specificities. Therefore, in [Part B](#) of this resource, the focus therefore shifts to local and regional specificities that need to be taken into account when discussing and implementing *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)*.

Lastly, in [Part C](#) of this resource, a brief summary of findings and proposed next steps is provided. These primarily derive from input received during the main session on intersessional activities at IGF 2016 in Guadalajara, Mexico, where the IGF's intersessional activities in general and *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)* Phase II in particular were discussed.

Objectives of Phase II

The analysis provided in this resource aims to provide a reasonable, multistakeholder, and balanced reflection of submissions received with the objective of delivering a useful output that is reflective of general trends relevant to the challenge of connecting and enabling more Internet users.

For Phase II, the focus of this initiative was two-fold:

1. To investigate how meaningful access can support the SDGs ([Part A](#)); and,

⁵ See: www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals.

2. Explore the local and regional specificities that need to be kept in mind when addressing connectivity concerns ([Part B](#)).

The overall objective of this resource is to drive stakeholder participation and collaboration around meaningful access and to demonstrate the value of the IGF as an inclusive, multistakeholder platform for engagement on complex challenges facing the development of the Internet and its governance in line with the IGF's mandate as prescribed by the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society (WSIS, 2005).

Methodology: Phase II

Phase II of *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)* made use of the bottom-up, inclusive and multistakeholder-driven approach that defines the IGF and its intersessional processes. Its work was primarily driven by three rounds of online public consultations that facilitated the participation of a diverse selection of stakeholders. All contributors' details are credited in the outcome document (see [Appendix 1](#) for a list of contributions) as well as on the IGF's website,⁶ where the submissions are also published in full (as far as possible).

In Phase II's initial planning stage (round one of input), the framework document ([Appendix 2](#)) that formed the basis of the activity's work was developed with the assistance of the multistakeholder community using the IGF's mailing lists and discussions during MAG online meetings. Ten (10) substantive written contributions were received from individual and MAG stakeholders.

Various individuals and MAG members also volunteered to assist the initiative in a more direct manner, and as a result an Editorial Working Group was formed. This Working Group was responsible for shaping the framework of the output document; for encouraging input; for helping to edit the document; for assisting in the organisation of the presentation of Phase II's outcomes at IGF 2016 in Guadalajara, Mexico, which was held from 6 to 9 December 2016; and in reviewing and editing this final output document.

⁶ The submissions can be viewed online, at: IGF (2016). *Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s) – Phase II* (Submissions tab). Available at: <http://intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/policy-options-for-connecting-and-enabling-the-next-billions-phase-ii>. [Accessed 22 September 2016].

In the second round of input, a call for input (see [Appendix 3](#)) was issued to various Internet governance community mailing lists to elicit both background input on the focus themes, and responses to a comprehensive list of questions in the call for input. Targeted outreach to stakeholders working in fields relevant to the theme was also done at this time; and interested NRIs, DCs and BPFs were similarly encouraged to participate.

Initial contributions received following the call for input were analysed with the aim of identifying commonalities and differences across submissions. Common themes were extracted and summarised, as far as was reasonable and deemed relevant, in Draft I by an editor appointed for managing the project⁷ by the IGF Secretariat. Where relevant in the text below, the contributors are identified (for individual contributors, the country a contributor is from, is also listed). Draft I was further augmented with background contributions received from contributors and collected through a light literature review of relevant and recently published reports and other publications.

Draft I was published on the IGF's review platform⁸ on 1 November 2016, and remained open for public comment for a period of 21 days. It was then closed for public comments on 22 November 2016, and the comments received, along with other submissions received in the interim from stakeholders, were incorporated into Draft I in order to compile Draft II. Draft II was published on the IGF's review platform⁹ for a third round of public input of 21 days before and during the annual IGF meeting in Guadalajara, where it was further discussed.

Over 60 direct written responses from 44 unique contributors were received in the rounds of input; seven of which were from National and/or Regional IGF Initiatives (NRIs). These include both background contributions (in the form of research or reports, for example), responses to all or some of the questions in the call for input (see [Appendix 3](#)), and comments on the IGF's review platform.

This is the third and final draft of this document, and reflects not only written input received to different rounds of input and other late contributions, but also oral input received at diverse sessions at the IGF relevant to the Phase II work of *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)*. This includes feedback on national and regional specificities gathered during the main session on NRIs (IGF, 2016b), and a day-zero event hosted by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), the Internet Society (ISOC), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the US Department of

⁷ Anri van der Spuy.

⁸ Available at: www.intgovforum.org/review/.

⁹ *Ibid.*

State's Global Connect, the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the World Bank, and the World Economic Forum (WEF). The latter event was organized with the aim of, among other things, serving as an input to *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s) – Phase II* in leveraging these different organizations' activities and communities in implementing and accelerating progress on expanding 'an accessible, global, and open Internet for everyone' (IGF, 2016a).

Phase II also gathered useful feedback during a main session dedicated to the IGF's intersessional activities at the IGF (IGF, 2016c), moderated by Alison Gillwald (Research ICT Africa, South Africa) and Helani Galpaya (LIRNEasia, India). A substantial proportion of the session was dedicated to *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s) – Phase II*. Anri van der Spuy (editor of Phase II) provided an overview of the methodology followed by the community in producing the resource, while invited panellists who participated and shared their experiences and recommendations for next steps included Constance Bommelaer (ISOC), Frank La Rue (UNESCO), Alex Wong (WEF), and Christopher Yoo (1 World Connected, the University of Pennsylvania) (see [Part C](#) of this resource for a summary).

Potential limitations of Phase II

This resource builds on the foundations provided by Phase I of this initiative, which was concerned with promoting Internet access in general. As noted, Phase II addresses meaningful access, how connectivity can support the SDGs, and national and regional specificities that are important in connecting and enabling the next billion(s). Although many contributions received contain valuable content pertaining to connectivity in general, this resource is limited in scope to the content more specifically related to these topics.

This resource provides a synthesised analysis and summary of the contributions submitted by a variety of stakeholders in response to open calls for input and rounds of public consultation. Therefore, the process and related output is primarily reflective of and contained to the input received from the multistakeholder community during this bottom-up and inclusive process.

Additionally, because this theme is highly dependent on and reflective of technological developments in fields pertaining to access infrastructure, this resource provides a snapshot relevant to a particular moment in time.

PART A: ACCESS AND THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

The SDGs

UN member states and the UN General Assembly formally adopted the SDGs on 25 September 2015 as part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN General Assembly, 2015). This document sets out a global framework for development that not only builds on the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) – which primarily focused on addressing poverty-related challenges in developing countries – but that are also far broader in that the SDGs address economic, social and environmental agendas across both developed and developing regions (c.f., GSMA, 2016b).

The 17 SDGs, which came into force on 1 January 2016, are not legally binding but create expectations for governments, with the assistance of other stakeholders (c.f., Cerf, 2016), to assume ownership and establish national frameworks for achieving these goals (UN, 2016):

Countries have the primary responsibility for follow-up and review of the progress made in implementing the Goals, which will require quality, accessible and timely data collection. Regional follow-up and review will be based on national-level analyses and [will] contribute to follow-up and review at the global level.

The Agenda for Sustainable Development specifically acknowledges the role of ICTs and the Internet as horizontal enablers for development, or crosscutting ‘means of implementation’. Paragraph 9-c in particular sets an important goal relevant to the multistakeholder Internet governance community, namely to:

Significantly increase access to information and communications technology and strive to provide universal and affordable access to the Internet in least developed countries by 2020.

Without meeting this goal, the Internet will be unable to meet its potential as a ‘powerful tool’ for sustainable development (ISOC, 2015). The Broadband Commission for Sustainable Development (Broadband Commission) highlighted that while ICTs and broadband can be a significant enabler to achieve progress for realising the SDGs, sufficient investment opportunities must also be created for the universal deployment of broadband and their related services and application; along with ‘a stronger alignment and collaboration between existing initiatives’ (2016b). Furthermore, Ericsson (2016), takes the view that while the full potential of ICTs for the SDGs are ‘neither systematically

nor adequately reflected' in the Agenda for Sustainable Development, the potential of unfolding innovations like the Internet of Things (IoT), advanced robotics, artificial intelligence (AI), and big data can offer substantial global gains for the SDGs.

Many stakeholders argue that the Internet is crucial to the important transformation in the ways in which humans communicate with one another, leading to a world in which 'communication is quicker, information is more available, commerce [is] more efficient and entertainment and education more easily accessible than ever before' (GSMA, 2016a). The World Bank (2016) also stressed in its recent *World Development Report: Digital Dividends* that '[w]e find ourselves in the midst of the greatest information and communications revolution in human history' where the 'poorest households are more likely to have access to mobile phones than to toilets or clean water' (2016).

But – as was also noted in Phase I of this initiative – a vast proportion of the world's citizens remain unable to benefit from this transformation and the sustainable development potentially enabled by it, with traditional development challenges 'preventing the digital revolution from fulfilling its transformative potential' (World Bank, 2016). Before looking at both the generic and specific ways in which connectivity can support the SDGs, it is important to investigate attempts and policy options to meet the SDG 9-c target in more detail.

Meeting the SDG 9-c target of universal access

For universal access to support the SDGs, it needs to be both universal and meaningful. While there may be a growing number of initiatives at local, regional, and global levels aimed at improving the quantity and quality of access, much needs to be done to ensure universal and meaningful access. The World Wide Web Foundation (Web Foundation), for instance, predicts that based on current trends, the goal of universal access will only be reached in 2042 (n.d.). Statistics indicate that most offline populations are contained to a small number of countries, with China, India and Indonesia together accounting for 45% of the global offline population in 2013 (Broadband Commission, 2016a). Many of these offline populations also share similar barriers to access (c.f., World Bank, 2016) – as is addressed in more detail [below](#).

Many of the ‘next billion(s)’ are either unable to benefit from Internet access at all or are barely connected. As the Association for Progressive Communications (APC) (2016a) notes:

[T]here is actually a spectrum of connectivity levels ranging from complete disconnection up to the fully connected on high bandwidth unlimited connections, with the majority of connected people somewhere in between.

APC (2016b) takes the view that the key to meaningful access is ‘giving local people the skills and tools to solve their own connectivity challenges’. It argues that ‘we need fewer ‘satellite and balloon’ projects, and more human development (2016b). The Web Foundation similarly states that initiatives aimed at supporting SDG targets must ‘build on the right foundations’ to truly support sustainable development (n.d.).

What these ‘right foundations’ are were discussed in Phase I of this initiative, and are briefly recapped below before delving deeper into stakeholders’ understanding of what *meaningful* access entails and why it is so important for sustainable development.

Core lessons from Phase I: *Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion*

Many stakeholders highlighted the general and encompassing need for establishing enabling environments in Phase I, including the importance of creating environments conducive to investment through supportive policies, regulations, and legislation. Phase I also focused on developing a set of policy options aimed at fostering enabling environments, including deploying infrastructure, increasing usability, enabling users (e.g., through ICT and media literacy, as well as training tools), and ensuring affordability.

In terms of **deploying infrastructure**, key findings from Phase I include that more investment in and partnerships to support infrastructure development is vital and a key driver for socio-economic growth and sustainable development. Priorities highlighted include the continued deployment of Internet exchange points (IXPs) to decrease costs and stimulate further development in local ecosystems (see the IGF [BPF on IXPs](#) for more information), along with the need to support the transition to Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6) to ensure sustainable Internet expansion (see the IGF [BPF on IPv6](#) for more information). Another important dimension highlighted in Phase I was the need to improve the use of universal service and access funds (USFs) for enabling Internet access through

(regulatory) provisions for network expansion, the support of public access facilities (discussed in more detail [below](#)), and (among other things) explicitly ensuring access among women and marginalised communities.

Phase I also emphasised the need to **increase usability** to ensure that people can truly benefit from Internet access. Contributors noted the importance of ensuring the availability of relevant content and applications that people can actually use, which is also available in local languages, and with content relevant to local contexts; emphasizing accessibility for people with disabilities; and ensuring that local media support the need for local content.

The need to increase usability is closely linked to the need to **enable and empower users**, and was also highlighted in Phase I. Not only do people need to be able to retrieve, produce and distribute information over the Internet, but they also need to do so in a way that protects and promotes their human rights online, enables them to become digital citizens in an inclusive manner, and expands and empowers them through dedicated user literacy efforts. The need to promote and enable the youth, people with disabilities, and the elderly was also stressed in this context.

Cost was identified as one of the most significant barriers to connecting the next billion Internet users by stakeholders, making the importance of **ensuring affordability** a key recommendation of Phase I. Contributions to Phase I highlighted the importance of more collaboration and targeted partnerships to bring down costs, along with the need for innovative policies and methods to bridge various digital divides.

Contributors also generally stressed the need for multistakeholder collaboration to address and achieve forward-looking connectivity goals. Access, contributors noted, should be universal, equitable, secure, affordable, of high quality, and supportive and reflective of human rights. For this reason, many contributors emphasised the need to support groups that may experience access challenges more profoundly or differently than others, including women, youth, elderly people, disabled people, cultural minority groups, and various other minorities.

The compilation output document from Phase I was presented and discussed during a main session at IGF 2015 in João Pessoa, Brazil, on 11 November 2015. During the session, the compilation received broad approval from the IGF community and it was suggested that the document should not only be shared with relevant organizations and processes working on related issues, but that this intersessional activity should continue in 2016.

Phase II: Enabling the next billion(s) by ensuring *meaningful* access

Besides connectivity, various contributors to Phase II stress that access does not automatically translate to adoption and/or developmental benefits – it also needs to be meaningful to enable beneficial adoption. The Broadband Commission, for instance, notes that meaningful Internet access requires ‘relevant, affordable content, available in the right language and offering the capability to transform information into actionable knowledge’ (2016a). In a recent report on how ICTs can accelerate action on the SDGs (addressed in more detail [below](#)), Jeffrey D. Sachs argues that while ICT is ‘the most powerful new tool we have for solving the world’s major challenges’, technology ‘by itself’ is ‘never a solution’, nor is it a panacea (in Ericsson, 2016):

It must be properly deployed—directed towards social purposes—and extended to the poor and to remote regions that markets alone will not serve, at least not in a timely way. Put simply, technology must be combined with a will towards the common good. In our era, that means harnessing it to the global objectives embodied by the MDGs and SDGs.

The World Bank (2016) affirms while access to digital technology and broadband may have expanded significantly, the broader developmental benefits from using these technologies (what the report terms ‘digital dividends’) have lagged behind (2016). It argues that digital dividends are not spreading fast enough for two reasons – the fact that almost 60% of the world’s population are still offline and that there are ‘persistent digital divides’ in gender, geography, age, and income dimensions within and between countries. In respect of the latter, the Broadband Commission points out that the majority of offline populations are ‘disproportionately poor, rural, old and female’ (2016a).

Towards meaningful access

APC takes the view that ICTs remain constrained from supporting sustainable development due to inequalities in current access levels. It stresses that there is a risk that those who do not have access at all, or are only ‘barely connected’ may be ‘doubly excluded’ from the potential benefits that connectivity could offer for their sustainable development. As such, many are at risk of being (2016b):

[E]xcluded from the “new” world of information and communications that the internet delivers, and also excluded from the “old” analogue world they used to have access to – even if imperfectly – because so many of those services and opportunities are increasingly only available online.

Phase II of this initiative therefore encourages stakeholders to not only focus on connecting the next billion(s) Internet users, but also on enabling them and the barely connected through meaningful and pervasive access to the Internet (c.f., APC, 2016b).

DiploFoundation argues in its original contribution to CENB Phase II that connecting and enabling users requires a multi-layered approach that enables both technical and human development in a manner that supports ‘core human and societal aims’ (2016). Various other contributors similarly note that meaningful access is a challenge that transcends the issue of infrastructure, and requires investments in the development of human capabilities and what the World Bank terms analogue (or ‘analog’) complements (2016):

For digital technologies to benefit everyone everywhere requires closing the remaining digital divide, especially in internet access. But greater digital adoption will not be enough. To get the most out of the digital revolution, countries also need to work on the “analog complements”— by strengthening regulations that ensure competition among businesses, by adapting workers’ skills to the demands of the new economy, and by ensuring that institutions are accountable.

Contributors to Phase II respectively stress that meaningful access requires ensuring that people, for example:

- **Are able to use services to benefit from access, regardless of whether they are in rural or urban areas** (Zimbabwe IGF, 2016; Rahman, 2016);
- **Can both consume and produce content**, i.e., that they:
 - ‘Hve the skills to meaningfully engage online and critically understand the content they consume – as well as empower them with skills for them to create content’ (Oghia, Serbia, 2016a);
 - Can ‘take part fully in the global and local information society’ by having not only the capability to consume and interpret various media types from a wide array of sources, but also the tools and skills to produce content themselves’ (DC for Public Access in Libraries, 2016); and

- Have ‘the necessary abilities to generate, process and/or share information’ that fosters the economic and social development (Federal Telecommunications Institute, Mexico, 2016).
- **Can take part in processes aimed at ensuring meaningful access**, i.e., that they:
 - Are more aware of Internet governance processes and the relevance of such processes to them (Rayamajhi, Nepal, 2016); and
 - Are engaged in the ‘definition of priorities, design, development and implementation; of policies and programmes aimed at sustainably addressing meaningful access’ (Hendi, Canada, 2016).
- **Are able to become and benefit from being responsible consumers**, i.e. that they:
 - Are provided the ‘right product and services’ to meet their specific needs as users (Ogero Telecom, Lebanon, 2016); and
 - Are able to ‘assume responsibility’ for their online activities, which includes the ability to realise the importance of media literacy training, informed consent, the capacity to participate fully online, and understanding that human rights apply equally online and offline (EuroDIG, 2016).

To ensure that meaningful access also serves the SDGs, enabling all users to benefit from the economic and social benefits associated with a ‘full and pervasive affordable connectivity environment’ (APC, 2016a) is necessary. APC stresses the need for pragmatic and objective policies and strategies to be ‘efficiently and rapidly implemented’ through ‘extensive public consultation that includes all stakeholder groups’; along with measurable targets by which to judge and ensure their effectiveness (2016b).

DiploFoundation also reinforces the importance of ‘ongoing capacity development’ to support related policy development; which includes the need for ‘continual access to expertise and sharing of best practices’ (2016). These policies should target not only the supply-side barriers, but also demand-side barriers through relevant support for training programmes (c.f., 1 World Connected, 2016). (See Phase I of this initiative for a more detailed analysis of supply and demand-side barriers).

Bridging various digital divides

Contributors to Phase II note that some of the barriers or limitations not only restricting access in general but also preventing people who do have some level of Internet access from being enabled or empowered through such connectivity include:¹⁰

- The **quality** and speed of **such** access;
- The relative (in)**affordability** of broadband and devices;
- Insufficient **knowledge** or **awareness** regarding the potential relevance of the Internet;
- A lack of **digital literacy**;
- The perceived irrelevance of **content** and services available online, including a lack of localised content and services in local **languages**;
- Fears of **surveillance** and the absence of **trust** in accessing services via ICTs;
- Security **threats** faced online and enabled by ICT-use, including threats of online abuse and gender-based violence; and
- The legal and **regulatory frameworks** concerned (including the level of **support** given in developing connectivity policies and programmes).

While most of these barriers were evaluated in detail in Phase I (2015) of this initiative, a few additional comments pertaining to how these barriers interact are notable and relevant to Phase II of this initiative. APC, for instance, points out that high costs and other barriers create ‘a strong chilling effect on usage’ (2016a); particularly because many of these barriers are inextricably linked and/or closely related.

GSMA, for example, notes that an increase in locally relevant content by itself will not lead to more meaningful engagement if people do not have the skills to access and use such content (2016a). GSMA

¹⁰ Summarised from barriers cited by contributors, including: 1 World Connected, 2016; UNHCR, 2016; Facebook, 2016; Namanga, Cameroon, 2016; DiploFoundation, 2016; GSMA, 2016a; Oghia, Serbia, 2016; APC, 2016a; Rayamajhi, Nepal, 2016; Zimbabwe IGF, 2016; Ogero Telecom, Lebanon, 2016; the Federal Telecommunications Institute, Mexico, 2016; VimpelCom, 2016; Lima, Brazil, 2016; public comment responses received by APRIGF, 2016b; Central Africa IGF, 2016; Zazai, Afghanistan, 2016; Hendi, Canada, 2016.

also suggests that content availability and relevance roughly correlate with a country's economic status. Developing countries, particularly in the Middle East and North Africa, Asia Pacific and Sub-Saharan Africa, are more likely to 'suffer from a lack of locally relevant content relative to their more economically developed peers' (GSMA, 2016a). (The ways in which barriers affect specific regions are discussed in more detail in [Part B](#) of this resource.)

Access inequalities and barriers like content availability not only affect those in developing countries more profoundly, but also those in rural areas as well as cultural minorities, women, refugees, and disadvantaged groups. The World Bank notes that there are still 'persistent digital divides across gender, geography, age, and income dimensions within each country' (2016). GSMA similarly points out that social norms and disparities in terms of levels of education and income compound other barriers to meaningful access, which leads to significant digital divides (2016a). APC argues that social inequalities have to be taken into account when addressing connectivity challenges (2016b):

[T]hose with the least connectivity are by and large also those who are most excluded economically, socially and politically. Their lack of access is first and foremost a result of this exclusion and while the internet may present opportunities for some social advancement, it will not alter the structural social and economic processes that causes inequality and exclusion in the first place.

The need to specifically consider the barriers **women** face in gaining access was stressed by various contributors (e.g., GSMA, 2015a). The IGF's [BPF on Gender and Access 2016](#) underscored that women are less likely and/or able to benefit from access to the Internet than men, particularly in developing countries (2016). Recent statistics from the ITU indicate that men are more likely to have access to the Internet in all regions of the world, with the global Internet user gender gap actually growing from 11% in 2013 to 12.2% in 2016 (2016a). This tendency is evident in developing countries but less so in developed countries, where access inequalities improved from 5.8% in 2013 to 2.8% in 2016. At 23%, the access gap is the largest in Africa and the smallest in the Americas (2%). Furthermore, in Least Developed Countries (LDCs), furthermore, approximately one out of seven people will be online by the end of 2016 – and only 31% of them will be women (Broadband Commission, 2016:46).

GSMA notes that gaps such as the gender digital divide, for instance, are 'driven by a complex set of socio-economic and cultural barriers' demanding 'targeted intervention'. GSMA takes the view that when women have access to the Internet through, for instance, mobile phones, 'there are significant benefits not only for women themselves, but for their communities and the broader economy as well

(2015a). The reasons for these discrepancies, along with initiatives that help to overcome these barriers to access, are also investigated in more detail in the IGF [BPF on Gender and Access 2016](#).

The need for targeted action to address access inequalities for women is also important in addressing access gaps in general. As the Alliance for Affordable Internet (A4AI) argues (2016a):

We cannot achieve universal access without bringing women (half the world's population) online; likewise, women's empowerment through ICTs will not happen without enabling women affordable access to the Internet.

In addition to women, targeted initiatives may furthermore be required to address the connectivity of **refugees** as well. Recent findings from a 2016 report by the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) indicate that refugees are 50% less likely to have access to an Internet-enabled device and more than twice as likely to have no phone at all. Such a lack of connectivity, the report points out, affects refugees' ability to access basic services and information, to communicate with loved ones, to seek and maintain employment, and to 'ultimately empower themselves'. The report also highlights that (2016:10-11):

For many, connectivity has become as critical for survival as food, water, and shelter. Without it, families often cannot make safe passage, receive protection, or ensure that their loved ones are alive.

The UNHCR notes that digital technology can serve as a 'critical enabler' of the new solutions needed to address the ongoing refugee crisis. Increased connectivity can help refugees to become more self-reliant by empowering them to organise themselves and share information among refugee communities, can help them to better position themselves as well as advocate more effectively through advanced access to relevant information, and can allow them to engage more meaningfully in all aspects of programmes that affect them (2016):

A connected refugee population would unleash innovation in areas such as communicating with displaced persons, responding to their security needs, and getting humanitarian services to them. Connectivity will improve lives and transform humanitarian operations.

Last but not least, a major barrier to effective solutions is a lack of systemic, rigorous **data** to guide activities and policy responses. The need to dedicate more efforts to ensuring work and activities to promote meaningful access actually meet real needs and demands was stressed by numerous stakeholders. In a day-zero feeding event at IGF 2016, organized by ICANN, ISOC, IEEE, ITU, Global

Connect, UNESCO, the World Bank, and WEF, difficulties around obtaining useful data from companies and governments were highlighted, along with legal impediments to data gathering. During the session the engagement of civil society in data gathering was identified as a 'key element' to gathering more impact data for comparison (IGF, 2016a).

Are all means of gaining access meaningful?

Many contributors to Phase II note the need to differentiate between mobile (or private, individual subscription-based) access and access using public access facilities when universal access goals are concerned. While public access facilities are vital for those who can afford neither their own devices nor data, it can also act as an important supplement to 'private' access. In its day-zero event at IGF 2016, ICANN, ISOC, IEEE, ITU, Global Connect, UNESCO, the World Bank, and WEF pointed out that there are two broad categories of needs around infrastructure development that also pertain to the differences between public and 'private' access (2016a):

The first involves areas which enjoy connectivity, but where an increased demand would drive investment and incentivize businesses to invest in these areas. The second category involve(s) areas where connectivity is low or non-existent, and there is no true demand.

APC takes the view that while support for the provision of public access facilities is waning in some countries due to a growth in mobile access, as well as views 'that public access is just a stepping stone to private access', public access remains vital. Some reasons include the fact that in some countries cultural norms and related barriers prevent women from being able to use mobile phones, as well as the fact that many of those restricted to mobile services face low speeds and capped traffic, which by itself could limit connectivity's potential to support sustainable development. As APC notes with regards to public access facilities as a complementary service for sustainable development (2016b; 2015a):

Large-format screens and high definition multimedia provide a more immersive learning, professional or entertainment experience, but may be too slow or costly via a mobile connection.

1 World Connected – a research project based at the University of Pennsylvania's Centre for Technology, Innovation, and Competition with the aim to catalogue, analyse, and disseminate information about approaches to connect more users to the Internet – notes in its submission that their research indicates there are regions where public access facilities or community anchor

institutions such as schools and libraries are more effective mechanisms for providing meaningful access. These include that such facilities often provide access to free training programmes, which develops skills for users to utilise such programmes; it is often easier for social responsibility initiatives to collaborate with public access facilities as opposed to setting up their own digital literacy training programmes; and such facilities also provide an environment where peer networks can be formed and learning can be enhanced through group activities, which often improves uptake (2016).

In its most recent annual *Affordability Report*, A4AI similarly notes that devices and access remain unaffordable to vast segments of the population. For this reason, they propose (among other things) increased investment in and the availability of public, subsidised access for groups that experience prohibitive access costs, or groups that are otherwise excluded (e.g., women), in order to achieve the SDG target of universal access. A4AI also takes the view that public access can help to support other SDGs (2016a:40):

Public access facilities offer broadband-enabled services, but they also double up as entities that provide educational opportunities, digital literacy training and, in many cases, skill development and distance learning opportunities.

For this reason, A4AI proposes that policymakers should work to strengthen local knowledge on how to create ‘sustainable public access venues’ that offer ‘locally relevant content and services such as e-government services, and that could be funded through USFs (2016a).

The IGF Dynamic Coalition (DC) on Community Connectivity takes the view that because almost 60% of the world’s population live in rural areas or urban slums, novel approaches must be adopted if the Internet is to reach everyone (2016a). One example of such an approach, suggested by the DC as well as other contributors (e.g., Jensen, 2016), is community networks (CNs). The potential of CNs in enabling more meaningful access was also repeatedly stressed at various sessions at IGF 2016, including during the main session on the IGF’s intersessional activities (IGF, 2016c) and the aforementioned day-zero event organized by ICANN, ISOC, IEEE, ITU, Global Connect, UNESCO, the World Bank, and WEF (IGF, 2016a).

CNs are structured to be open, free, and neutral, and rely on the active participation of local communities in the design, development, deployment, and management of the shared infrastructure as a common resource, owned by the community, and operated in a democratic manner. CNs can be operationalised, wholly or partly, through local stakeholders, NGOs, private sector entities and/or

public administrations; and are characterised by collective ownership, social management, open design and open participation, free peering and transit with networks offering reciprocity, as well as the promotion of free software and open standards and technologies (2016a; 2016b).

The DC on Community Connectivity points out that in the past ten years, a variety of successful examples of CNs have emerged on all continents, utilising many technical and governance configurations. Such examples (investigated in more detail in the [DC on Community Connectivity's annual report](#), 2016a) have demonstrated that CNs proffer a viable option to connect the unconnected while empowering local communities and building local technical capacities. Notably, the establishment of CNs has proven that local stakeholders, including public administrations, entrepreneurs and NGOs, may become important protagonists for the development of Internet connectivity; building infrastructure and proposing innovative sustainability models. Furthermore, CNs foster the development of new services, applications, and local content as well as job creation; as is illustrated in the Guifi.net and Digital Empowerment Foundation (DEF) India cases (see the DC on Community Connectivity's [annual report](#) for more detail pertaining to these cases).

Examples of successful community connectivity initiatives can also be found in the submission of the Colombian National IGF Initiative, which notes that CNs can contribute to the creation of resilient infrastructure that can be maintained by the community in underserved rural areas in Colombia (2016). 1 World Connected similarly highlights the efforts of Rhizomatica to provide communities with technical and legal support to help deploy user-owned and operated networks through open-source technologies. Rhizomatica uses existing community organizing structures in rural Mexico to create more sustainable models where communities are personally involved and trained in the maintenance and deployment of networks, while Rhizomatica retains only a supporting and training role. Rhizomatica serves sixteen rural communities of 2,500 or fewer inhabitants as of December 2016, providing the first Internet access to these communities. This connectivity helps to facilitate mobile and Internet services for banking and healthcare services as well as communication in case of emergencies, home delivery services, and community-wide messaging by local leaders (1 World Connected, 2016).

CNs are therefore particularly useful in empowering communities and local entrepreneurs to solve their own connectivity challenges in a sustainable manner (DC on Community Connectivity, 2016a). At the 2016 African IGF, for instance, one of the recommendations offered was that the creation of CNs should be supported to not only connect communities to the Internet, but also to help enable the provision of other relevant infrastructure, like phone-charging stations in a community (2016).

The DC on Community Connectivity argues that public policies should be crafted in order to facilitate the establishment of CNs, as suggested by its [Declaration on Community Connectivity](#). It argues that ‘CNs are an example of connectivity for local communities by local communities through the community and relevant stakeholders’ (2016a). CNs can therefore help to empower communities and local entrepreneurs to solve their own connectivity challenges in a sustainable manner (DC on Community Connectivity, 2016b):

Bottom-up strategies that embrace non-discriminatory treatment of Internet traffic and diversity in the first square mile can truly empower individuals and communities, allowing everyone to play an active role in making connectivity affordable and easily accessible.

Similar to the rationale for CNs, the APriGF also takes the view that ‘frugal innovation’ – or low-cost solutions that originate from local communities, use local knowledge and resources, and meet specific local needs – must be included in national development agendas as they tend to fulfil needs neglected by mainstream businesses (2016a):

While scientists, technologists, innovators and entrepreneurs are considered the traditional sources of innovative activity, there is potentially untapped resource of talent residing in under-represented communities, including women.

How Internet connectivity can generally support the SDGs

The potential impact of broadband access on the SDGs has been noted by a number of organizations. APC, for instance, argues that ‘affordable and reliable internet access has become a vital means to exercise fundamental human rights and to support economic, social and human development’ (2016b). Similarly, UNESCO affirms in the outcome document from its *Connecting the Dots: Options for Future Action* conference that ICTs’ ability to increase access to information and knowledge also ‘supports sustainable development and improves people’s lives’ (2015). In the most recent *The State of Broadband Report* (2016), the Broadband Commission also notes that broadband ‘can play a vital role in achieving the SDGs’ and ‘underpinning inclusive and sustainable development’. It notes (2016a):

A large body of economic evidence has amassed for the role of affordable and effective broadband connectivity as a vital enabler of economic growth, social inclusion and environmental protection.

Individual and other stakeholders contributing to Phase II similarly note that connecting and enabling users with meaningful Internet access, along with associated reduced communication costs and improved access to information/knowledge, can support all of the SDGs to some extent (e.g., Saldanha, 2016; World Bank, 2016). Anthony Namanga argues in his contribution to Phase II that the Internet ‘cuts across all the different SDGs, starting from Goal 1 to Goal 17’ (Cameroon, 2016). Other contributors indicate that the Internet and ICTs have the potential to act as cross-cutting enablers for sustainable development (e.g., Federal Telecommunications Institute, Mexico, 2016) or as providers of ‘new ways of sharing and analysing information’ (ISOC, 2016b). Kim Lilianne Henri takes the view that ICTs are multidimensional and dynamic, thus they simultaneously impact and involve structures and processes on diverse levels of government, in numerous sectors, and on various stakeholders and partnerships (Canada, 2016). Ericsson, in turn, argues that every goal can be positively impacted by ICTs as ‘the essential infrastructure platform for the SDGs’ (2016):

[T]he digital revolution currently under-way is paving the way for an Age of Sustainable Development—a profound transformation of society where technology is a key contributor to human and planetary wellbeing.

The Broadband Commission explains that there are macroeconomic, microeconomic and individual empowerment arguments to be made for the capacity of broadband to support development. The ICT sector itself can contribute to the gross domestic product (GDP) of countries, can stimulate innovation, and can improve access to new markets. Microeconomic arguments tend to focus on productivity gains at firm levels, including through more efficient working methods, the automation of some tasks, and reduced production costs. The importance of individual empowerment is also stressed by a number of Phase II contributors, although – as the Broadband Commission points out – ‘many studies focus on the potential of ICTs, rather than actual impact’ (2016a).

Various recent reports published in 2016 have also listed ways in which ICTs may impact the SDGs. For instance, NetHope takes the view that ICTs can support the SDGs by enhancing stakeholders’ capacity to measure and evaluate progress towards all of the SDGs; providing opportunities for streamlining and enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of all activities in the development ecosystem; and providing access to a new range of digitally enabled products and services to strengthen local economies, local innovation and local communities (2016). In its recent report on

how specifically the mobile industry's core business can support the SDGs, GSMA argues that the mobile industry in particular can play a crucial role in supporting or impacting almost half of the 169 supporting targets of the SDGs by helping to include more people by scaling networks and access; by innovating in order to create new ways to enhance quality and ease of access; and by influencing policies and partnerships to contribute to sustainable development (2016b).

Ericsson similarly notes that ICTs can speed up and increase the rate of diffusion of relevant services, 'helping low-income countries to leapfrog to achieve key development milestones while contributing to a growth economy'. It lists five ways in which ICTs can support the SDGs when combined with innovative policies, series and solutions, namely by (2016):

- Upscaling critical services in health, education, financial services, smart agriculture, and low-carbon energy systems;
- Reducing deployment costs in addressing urban and rural realities;
- Enhancing public awareness and engagement;
- Supporting innovation, productivity, and efficiency; and
- Upgrading the quality of services and jobs more quickly.

The ways in which connecting and enabling the next billion(s) supports the SDGs in a cross-cutting manner therefore include the Internet's ability to expand access to information, reduce communication and information costs, and enable increased knowledge and information-sharing (e.g., UNESCO, 2015; World Bank, 2016; UNHCR, 2016). In the experience of Ogero Telecom, for instance, the Internet provides a 'vital platform for the growth of ICT and for the emerging knowledge economy in which information is crucial to create new and improved products and services' (Lebanon, 2016). GSMA similarly argues that the Internet is a 'game changer for development' in that it facilitates a 'dramatic increase in the amount of information available to the average global citizen'; leading to more opportunities for collaboration and productive interaction among stakeholders that support the development of sustainable economies and societies (2016a). In its submission, the Central Africa IGF, which gathered input from Cameroon, Chad, Congo-Brazzaville, and the Democratic Republic of Congo, also emphasises the importance of information-sharing and access (2016).

Contributors listed various ways in which connectivity can bolster knowledge societies and impact sustainable and inclusive development more broadly, including, for instance, the ability to respond

to disasters and emergencies more swiftly; to engage the youth in development processes; to support better decision-making and evidence-based public action; and to aid overall accountability and transparency efforts (discussed in more detail [below](#)). As the Internet Society (ISOC) notes (2015):

Of course the Internet is not ‘the answer’ to the challenges of poverty, inequality and environmental degradation. But it offers new ways of sharing and analysing information - new tools for delivering on the Sustainable Development Goals.

Ensuring Internet access actually supports the SDGs

While technology and connectivity therefore have the potential to support the SDGs, various contributors note that achieving this potential will depend on the **quality, level and nature** of connectivity. Mexico’s Federal Telecommunications Institute explains in its contribution that progress will ‘depend on reliable, robust, available, safe and trustworthy infrastructure and communications services’ (2016). Furthermore, the Central Africa IGF furthermore stresses the need to raise awareness among the **youth** and vulnerable communities about the SDGs (2016). Facebook also notes the importance of global **partnerships** and coordination – including among governments, industries, civil society, and local communities – to expand access (2016).

A holistic understanding of **local contexts** is also vital to ensuring that access and ICTs do support connectivity goals – as is illustrated from an example submitted by the Zimbabwe IGF to Phase II, and is further investigated in [Part B](#) of this resource. The submission details how a project in rural Tanzania in 2012, which aimed to encourage citizens to compel local authorities to maintain and repair broken water pumps by using text or short message services (SMS), was unsuccessful. The Zimbabwe IGF notes that the initiative’s failure can be attributed to a variety of reasons, including the fact that citizens were reluctant to report on their government in local communities; water collection in the communities concerned is generally the responsibility of women and children who often do not have access to Internet-enabled devices; and a lack of reliable electricity supply and limited mobile network coverage also hampered citizens from consistently using the service (Zimbabwe IGF, 2016).

In addition to the need to take local contexts and analogue complements into consideration, there are also **risks** involved in using ICTs to support the SDGs. Ericsson, for instance, notes fears regarding increased risks to privacy and of surveillance; cybersecurity; the loss of relevant human skills’

possible public concern about health effects; electronic waste and carbon emissions; digital exclusion; and child protection online (Ericsson, 2016). GSMA similarly warns that the (mobile) industry will have to learn to manage like privacy and data concerns, e-waste, and the increasing energy requirements driven partly by the growth and demand for mobile data (2016).

Lastly, contributors also argue that more **research** is needed to understand connectivity challenges if the SDGs are to be served. 1 World Connected – a research project based at the University of Pennsylvania’s Centre for Technology, Innovation and Competition to catalogue, analyse and disseminate information about innovative approaches to connect more users – argues in its submission for ‘a data-driven approach to develop a nuanced understanding of both demand- and supply-side drivers’ of broadband Internet adoption (2016).¹¹

Kim Lilianne Henri similarly points out that ‘the lack or limitation of journaling of experiences, stories and *processes* in using ICTs to support development is a challenge, as well as an opportunity for future consideration’ (original emphasis, Canada, 2016). The need for more research, particularly in certain regions, was also emphasized in public comment responses received by the APriGF in its targeted effort to gather input for Phase II, which is further discussed in [Part B](#) below.

Access and the specific SDGs

The ways in which specific SDGs can be supported through connecting and enabling more users is addressed in more detail in this section. For some of the 17 SDGs, there is a more direct connection between the goal and connectivity than for others, as is reflected by the amount of content and examples submitted by stakeholders for each SDG. A summary of these contributions is provided below.

While most contributors highlight the Internet’s potential to support the SDGs more broadly, some also identified particular SDGs that meaningful access can support, and/or the ways in which certain SDGs, like Goal 9c mentioned above, can act as building blocks for other SDGs (Saldanha, 2016). Moreover, SDGs for infrastructure, gender equality and education also contain specific ICT targets.

¹¹ This project also submitted some useful case studies of initiatives that are helping to overcome various barriers to access. These examples are worked into the text below where possible, but more information about these initiatives can be found [online](#).

It should be noted that the role of ICTs in supporting a specific SDG is often inextricably linked to other SDGs. Ericsson, for instance, points out that financial inclusion via ICTs will not only help to reduce poverty ([SDG 1](#)) through employment and other income-generating opportunities ([SDG 8](#)), but also through supporting small and medium-sized enterprises ([SDG 9](#)). Higher incomes empower families to invest in education ([SDG 4](#)) and health ([SDG 3](#)), and offers access to improved nutrition and food security ([SDG 2](#)). The availability of credit, savings and insurance, for instance, can help to promote sustainable agriculture ([SDG 15](#)), and to provide more security during national disasters, financial crises or other challenges (see [SDG 10](#) below).

No poverty (SDG 1)¹²

Summary of targets: End poverty in all its forms everywhere

Contributors note that connecting and enabling users can help to alleviate poverty by, among other things, increasing productivity, bolstering transparency measures, promoting competitiveness, enabling access to new markets, giving people access to financial services through mobile and other devices, and ensuring the protection of consumers (through fair pricing, transparency, and faster payments, for example). Meaningful access can also support entrepreneurs in expanding their business, for example through mobile platforms (m-platforms), which can also be valuable platforms for providing financial services to impoverished communities.

Meaningful Internet access also helps to reduce poverty by increasing people's opportunities for gaining employment (addressed in more detail under [SDG 8 below](#)). The IGF's DC for Public Access in Libraries, for instance, notes that in Slovenia, the Ljubljana City Library hosts an employment information service that helps many homeless people as well as others develop their curriculum vitae (CV) and find work (2016). A 2015 study by John B. Horrigan for Comcast, which focused on low-income Internet users, has similarly found that the majority of Internet users in their study use the Internet to look and apply for a job, as well as to acquire new skills, gain training on how to start their own business, and to take classes online (2015).

GSMA takes the view that the mobile industry has a significant role to play in alleviating poverty by supporting economic growth (2016); while the World Bank having found that a 10% increase in

¹² Note that for ease of interpretation, the summary headings used by the UN for the SDGs have also been adopted in this resource.

mobile penetration is associated with a 1.35% increase in the GDP of developing countries. The mobile industry can support the goal of alleviating poverty by expanding knowledge of the economy, facilitating information exchange, and driving productivity and innovation (2016), among other ways. These effects also have wider social application; as they affect educational outcomes ([SDG 4](#)) and can improve health ([SDG 3](#)) (GSMA, 2016b), for instance.

Zero hunger (SDG 2)

Summary of targets: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture

Contributions reinforce the notion that the promotion of sustainable agriculture is closely tied to ending hunger, achieving food security and supporting improved nutrition. Internet access can support individuals and groups in the farming and fishing industries by facilitating applications for agricultural subsidies, finding information about new crops and innovative techniques, improving productivity, receiving and finding updates about real-time climate and other conditions, gaining access to new markets, and learning more about market needs and demands. As ISOC notes in a background contribution (2015):

Access to information is critical to farmers everywhere. The opportunity to seek advice from experts and share experience with other farmers can mean the difference between success and failure, especially for those working on marginal land.

In Uganda, for instance, community libraries use computers and Wi-Fi connection to the Internet to train farmers and community members to use technology and access information on new crops and farming methods, while in Romania, public library staff have worked with local governments to help farmers use new ICT services to apply for agricultural subsidies (DC for Public Access in Libraries, 2016).

In Papua New Guinea, for instance, connectivity provided by the Rural Communications Project has enabled rural farmers to gather information on supplies and prices in cities in ways they could not do before. As 1 World Connected notes (2016):

The benefits of rural connectivity are felt acutely in villages like Kore, which previously had no access to any form of telecommunications services. Initially, villagers had to climb up a hill to

receive weak mobile signals from a cell phone tower in Hula 25 kilometers away. The establishment of a base station in Kore allows farmers to order seeds and fertilizers using a cell phone instead of spending the extended time needed to travel to Port Moresby. Women entrepreneurs have started selling prepaid top-up cards to the villagers and set up solar-based charging stations for mobile phones. Access to services enhances economic opportunities for these communities.

Many contributors also point out that meaningful access is important in emergency or crisis situations, helping people to communicate and coordinate better to meet food and other needs, to enable quick and simple donations, and to support particularly needy areas. Shreedeeep Rayamajhi points out that the Internet is useful in times of crisis to promote safety and enable better management of resources. During the 2015 earthquake in Nepal, for instance, Shreedeeep could collaborate with various people through Facebook and other social media platforms to communicate and match particular needs with available resources in a more consistent and efficient manner (Nepal, 2016). 1 World Connected also notes that mobile phone services provided through the Rural Communications Project in Papua New Guinea, for instance, allows people in unconnected areas to reach medical assistance faster; thus helping to save lives (2016).

Good health (SDG 3)

Summary of targets: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages

Meaningful access can help sustain healthy lives and promote well-being at all ages by reducing costs (e.g., through disease surveillance and preventative campaigns); improving the quality of data, thereby helping to fight diseases by enabling medical service delivery and collaboration in health systems; training health professionals; and by generally improving efficiency and accountability (among other things) (e.g., Ericsson, 2016). The DC for Public Access in Libraries, for instance, points out that in Botswana, 87% of library visitors noted that their health improved as a result of health information they found using public library services (2016).

Contributors note that Internet access also enables the establishment of unified and better managed databases, including new abilities to integrate diverse parts of health services; better health reporting and early health warning detection systems; advanced systems of drug registration and

control; inoculation and vaccination registration systems; hospital management systems; and the maintenance of possible national electronic health records (e.g., Albania, 2016; Zimbabwe IGF, 2016).

Besides supporting an array of information systems, contributors point out that Internet access helps to empower individuals by enabling access to information on healthy choices and lifestyles (e.g., UNHCR, 2016). ISOC notes that especially in developing countries with a shortage of health workers, the Internet is a 'vital resource' for information and 'support to hard-pressed clinicians'. One estimate, ISOC points out, suggests that up to 59% of patients in emerging markets make use of mobile health services (2015). Additionally, Facebook notes that in Colombia, for instance, the digital platform 1doc3 helps doctors answer medical questions and has even enabled better engagement with the Colombian government on health matters (2016):

When 1doc3 noticed questions submitted regarding “condom water” from remote areas of Colombia, they investigated and found out that people in certain remote areas believe that boiling a condom and drinking the water helps prevent pregnancy. Taking that information back to the government, the service collaborated with the government on an education campaign targeted to remote areas where people believed in the practice.

For people in remote and/or rural areas, Internet access is also particularly useful for finding important health information, while connectivity also helps hospitals in such areas to be better linked with hospitals in urban areas. Ogero Telecom explains that an initiative in Lebanon, Telemedicine, links major hospitals in Beirut and abroad with hospitals in rural areas – enabling real-time video consultation between doctors and enabling the sharing of data and diagnostics from afar (2016).

In India, a similar initiative that forms a part of Wireless for Communities (W4CC), run by DEF and ISOC, provides telemedicine services at local public health centres. The project has provided internet connectivity that enables health care centres in rural Jharkhand and Tripura to provide telemedicine services and receive expert advice from doctors via Skype calls (1 World Connected, 2016).

Contributors also note that access helps to support health systems that promote cardiovascular health through proper monitoring (e.g., Arthur Zang's Cardio Pad; cited in Namanga, Cameroon, 2016); the combatting of diseases like tuberculosis (e.g., in Kyrgyzstan; cited in DC for Public Access in Libraries, 2016); and the more accurate reporting of births using mobile phones (e.g., the Uganda Mobile VRS, cited in GSMA, 2016a).

Access is also proving important in the promotion of maternal health and safety. In Myanmar, for instance, a maternal healthcare application provides advice to expectant parents; while in Uganda an affordable smartphone-based ultrasound helps to reduce neonatal and maternal mortality rates by enabling doctors and midwives to better monitor the health of fetuses and expectant mothers (GSMA, 2016a). In Nepal, furthermore, an application provides particularly low-income expectant mothers with relevant information to promote maternal health (Rayamajhi, Nepal, 2016).

Quality education (SDG 4)

Summary of targets: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all

Education and development of human capital – as a crucial investment in long-term economic development – remains an important challenge around the world. In various developing areas, a lack of basic infrastructure, conflict, and other challenges, such as adolescent pregnancy and child marriage, hamper enrolment and completion rates. Barriers to education affect women more profoundly, with two-thirds of the world’s illiterate adults being female (GSMA, 2016a). Yet, as various stakeholders point out, ICTs offers the potential for acceleration in helping to overcome these and other challenges (Ericsson, 2016; GSMA, 2016b).

ICT's accelerator role is a powerful mechanism in every aspect of education: teacher training, local curricula, local-language instruction, monitoring and assessment of student performance, education-systems management, coaching and mentoring, and preparing students for a world in which ICT is a necessity for successfully navigating their future careers and lives and contributing to their national economies.

Various other contributions also indicate that connecting and enabling users can help to ensure inclusive and equitable, quality education by (among other things) letting educational content be shared with larger audiences at lower costs, connecting classrooms, supporting teacher training, improving access to learning and teaching resources in both urban and rural areas, and making content more relevant, localised to the context and native language of the area, and responsive to learners’ needs (c.f., ISOC, 2015). In Lebanon, for instance, there are plans to configure all schools with wireless Internet access and to provide access to devices in classrooms. As Ogero Telecom notes in its contribution to Phase II (Lebanon, 2016):

Mobility, broadband and the cloud are key technologies that place connectivity at the forefront of change to enable users and to transform education and deliver quality schooling in the digital age.

The UNHCR points out that connectivity is furthermore crucial in enabling refugees to participate in online training courses and to access education remotely – including refugee children at primary or secondary school level who can have the opportunity, facilitated by Internet access, to continue their disrupted education in their primary language (2016):

Without connectivity, millions of displaced children won't get the education necessary to become the doctors, teachers and future leaders of their communities.

Access also enables teachers to engage in professional development, to share their knowledge, and to better meet their students' needs. The BridgeIT programme, for instance, shares educational content and enables teacher training using smartphones (GSMA, 2016b). ICTs and access can also support education systems by aiding logistical and financial management and enabling better networking between schools, private and public institutions, and interaction with relevant government departments of education.

Despite the many potential benefits that connectivity can have for education, there are still few schools that have Internet access depending on the country and geographical location. For instance, ISOC notes that there are fewer than 25% schools with Internet access in some developing countries (2015). Moreover, Kim Lilianne Henri stresses in her contribution that national education programmes in Latin America, for instance, tend to consider technological 'tools' as additional or 'external' to curricula – and by doing so, miss out on the potential of better using ICTs better to enhance existing curricula and to promote the formulation of 'integrative and complex perspectives' that can help to narrow digital divides (Canada, 2016).

Gender equality (SDG 5)

Summary of targets: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls

Promoting gender equality and empowering women and girls in line with SDG 5 requires not only that unequal access to infrastructure be addressed, but also that the costs of devices and connectivity be decreased, as contributors point out that affordability affects women more significantly than men.

It also requires addressing gender disparities in educational opportunities, including digital literacy, investing in the creation of content relevant and useful to women, and tackling gender-based harassment and abuse, both in physical spaces for accessing the Internet (such as public access facilities) and in online environments (including various forms of online harassment) (IGF [BPF on Online Abuse and Gender-Based Violence, 2015](#)).

Contributors point out that the promotion of gender equality can be supported through Internet access by enabling women's independence, social participation and autonomy; ensuring that more information is shared about gender equality and human rights; and enabling better access to information (including potentially sensitive information, like information related to sexual and reproductive health).

Furthermore, women's empowerment and gender equality are served, for example, through the support of female farmers and entrepreneurs. As GSMA points out, access to a smartphone in Kenya gives women the same opportunities as men in extending business contacts, increasing working hours and improving income (GSMA, 2016a). In India, for instance, the W3C initiative is providing ICT training, certification and diploma courses on computer concepts and tele-health technology courses at Chanderiyaan, which is located in Central India. As a result of wireless Internet and broadband, the weavers of Chanderiyaan are using e-commerce and Facebook to sell their crafts. Another initiative of W4C, the Wireless Women for Entrepreneurship & Empowerment, identifies women from self-help groups within communities and provides them with targeted training. The training helps to empower these women, who come from varied backgrounds, to become entrepreneurs by giving them the skills needed to set up and maintain websites for their goods and services (1 World Connected, 2016). For more case studies of initiatives aimed at overcoming barriers to women's access, see the [IGF BPF Gender and Access 2016](#).

A contributor to the APriIGF's public consultation also notes the importance of ICTs in enabling her and others to transcend gender inequality, find decent work and become economically empowered ([SDG 8](#)) (2016b):

Internet access has hugely changed my personal life and helped me change [the lives] of other women around me. The Women's Digital League was formed when I was fired from my teaching job because the private school I was working at would not give me maternity leave. Sitting at home with a simple dial up connection, I found remote work. Earning my first \$2.5 writing an article for someone in the US gave me much-needed confidence in my abilities. It was a stepping stone to becoming financially empowered and independent; being recognized as the top most

impactful entrepreneurs in Pakistan; and in showing women they didn't have to accept status quo. With greater financial empowerment I have seen young women not settle for the first proposal that came for them as they were no longer a burden on their household; send siblings to school/college; have greater say in decisions at home; be more respected and therefore have a higher self-esteem.

Contributors note that ensuring women have the skills and capacity to benefit from access is vital. In Cameroon, for instance, a centre for the promotion of female development, CEFEPD, supports women in developing their capacity to use and manage digital technology (Central Africa IGF, 2016). In Guatemala, the Rija'tzuul Na'ooj library's business centre offers free Internet access, technology and business skills training, and space to meet. It also teaches women how to advertise their products on social media and benefit from other skills learnt. In Uganda, the National Library offers ICT training specifically designed for female farmers, thus enabling them to learn more about weather forecasts and crop prices as well as helping them participate in online markets (DC for Public Access in Libraries, 2016).

Besides basic skills training, education in media and digital literacy must furthermore address human rights and democratic citizenship online (c.f., Council of Europe, 2016a). Expanding women's study of ICT-related topics and in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields is important to ensure the recruitment of women at all levels of organizations in new information and knowledge societies.

Various initiatives have been created to address the need to ensure women's sustainable development and gender equality in the digital age, including the [IGF BPF Gender and Access 2016](#), which is currently investigating barriers to access as well as the community-led responses to overcome such barriers. Another example is the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and UN Women's joint *Action Plan to Close the Digital Gender Gap*, which recognizes the 'transformative potential' of ICTs for inclusive and sustainable (women's) development (ITU, 2015). The Broadband Commission also has a Working Group on the Digital Gender Divide in 2016/7, and in September 2016, ITU and UN Women together launched its joint campaign called *EQUALS: The Global Partnership for Gender Equality in the Digital Age*.

Clean water and sanitation (SDG 6)

Summary of targets: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all

Contributors note that meaningful access can help to promote more sustainable water and sanitation solutions by reducing water waste; enabling better data sharing; promoting smart water extraction, treatment, and delivery infrastructure; developing connected water solutions; and protecting water and remotely monitoring its quality to allow early detection of contamination.

Samuel Guimarães Lima explains that in Brazil, for instance, embedded systems control water and sanitation management, and enable citizens to check information about these systems (Brazil, 2016).

Affordable and clean energy (SDG 7)

Summary of targets: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all (also see [SDG 13](#))

Among other things, meaningful access can help ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy through the use of online platforms for capacity-building related to renewable energy; the implementation of smart energy meters linked to applications that prevent wastage; and by facilitating access to information about energy distribution and conservation. Ericsson, for instance, takes the view that the ICT sector has the potential to transform the energy sector by delivering synergies across technologies for sensing and control; the automation of processes; energy storage; renewable energy generation; machine-to-machine interactions; efficient energy use by consumers; and employing smart metering and smart grids, for instance (2016).

Besides the ICT sector's potential to improve productivity and thus reduce power consumption and carbon emissions, it remains responsible for at least 2.3% of total global greenhouse gas emissions (as is discussed in more detail in [SDG 13 below](#)). As a result, Michael Oghia warns about the potentially detrimental effects of not only IoT, but also data generation and cloud computing (2016c) on energy consumption.

Moreover, a recent study by Mike Hazas, Janine Morley, Oliver Bates and Adrian Friday cautions that rising data demand 'has an equivalent direct energy cost as data is transmitted and processed. Despite step changes in energy efficiency as new technology is introduced, this could arguably be offset by innovations in the marketplace such as increased expectations around high-definition video'. These researchers also warn that 'the [IoT] is set to trigger a whirl-wind of investment and

connected infrastructure growth that has the massive potential to grow operational electricity use and energy of the Internet' (2016).

ICTs and the Internet, however, have the potential capacity to provide solutions that can reduce energy dependence and wastage in other sectors as a result of development pertaining to smart grids, transportation, buildings, work, travel, services, agriculture and land use. In the ICT sector more specifically, Michael Oghia argues that solutions are already manifesting in various ways and aiming to determine 'how the Internet and ICTs can become completely sustainable in the future as well as better address and ultimately solve 21st century challenges' (2016c).

The IGF DC on Internet and Climate Change similarly notes in its *Statement on Climate Change and the Internet* (2009):

... the Internet community is endeavoring to mitigate its own carbon footprint through new energy-efficient data centers, servers, applications and networks, and through the increased use of renewable energy supplies to power the Internet infrastructure.

Decent work and economic growth (SDG 8)

Summary of targets: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment, and decent work for all

Contributors emphasise the importance of meaningful access for sustainable, sustained and inclusive economic growth, as is also confirmed by various studies already done (c.f., GSMA, 2016a; UNHCR, 2016). Among other things, contributors point out that access can help increase efficiency, facilitate the sharing of knowledge, enhance innovation, support the emergence of new business models in the digital economy, and increase overall productivity and growth. It also supports the development of transparent and efficient systems that support and bolster economic growth, including for e-taxation systems and in sectors ranging from transport, energy, and media to banking (e.g., Central Africa IGF, 2016). As Mexico's Federal Telecommunications Institute notes (2016):

In recent years, the expansion of digital technology has operated as an engine for economic growth and for the transformation of the society as a whole, which contributes directly to the fulfilment of the SDGs.

Meaningful access can support full and productive employment by creating new jobs in new products and services; by producing tools to help people search for employment; by providing continuous training and online courses that can lead to more productive employment; and by providing economic opportunities in both urban and rural areas – also for people who might face barriers to finding employment, like women. As the World Bank notes (2016):

The internet's ability to reduce transaction costs increases opportunities for people who face barriers in finding jobs or productive inputs.

In South Africa, for example, a mobile application not only provides job-seeking advice and free coaching but also helps users automatically generate a CV based on users' answers to 12 questions; thus helping them to search for work. As GSMA notes, this application had a total of 300,000 users as of 2014, with 20% of users securing jobs relevant to their interest area and experience (2016a).

For refugees, increased connectivity can also be important in enabling them to become more self-reliant by making it easier to create and sustain their own businesses and to do remote work – something that is particularly important in areas in which refugees face constraints on the right to work or participate in local economies (UNHCR, 2016).

Connectivity can furthermore support small businesses and their owners who tend to find it difficult to access capital and financial services in developing countries; thereby stimulating new enterprises to emerge and grow. As ISOC notes in a background contribution (2015):

Mobile money has brought banking services to many small enterprises in countries such as Kenya, allowing them to manage their resources and build their businesses. More than 50% the adult population of Kenya now makes use of mobile money. The Internet is enabling more financial services than just mobile money, including credit and insurance, while online investment facilities, such as Kiva, are also making crowdfunding available to small businesses.

Contributors furthermore note that connecting and enabling users can help to ensure more decent work by raising awareness pertaining to labour rights and the need to eliminate forced labour. On the other hand, DiploFoundation points out while ICT deployment is vital to the digital economy, it can only fulfil its development potential if suitable 'education and capacity building are offered to workers, empowering them for current and upcoming challenges' (2016). This point is similarly stressed by the World Bank, which notes that new opportunities for work come 'hand in hand' with 'fundamental and rapid changes' in the world of work; with digital technologies not only increasing the demand for new and advanced skills, but also rendering other skills obsolete (2016).

The IGF's DC for Public Access in Libraries stresses the importance of libraries as major and/or sole providers of access to the Internet at low or no cost, to supporting economic development. In Latvia, for instance, for every dollar invested in public libraries from 2008 to 2010, nearly USD 2 in value (direct and indirect) was reportedly created. The return on investment of computers and Internet use in public libraries was even higher, returning more than USD 3 for every USD 1 invested (DC for Public Access in Libraries, 2016).

Industry, innovation and infrastructure (SDG 9)

Summary of targets: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation

Contributions indicate that ICTs act as overall enablers to help build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialisation, and foster innovation. As Ogero Telecom notes (Lebanon, 2016):

From bringing the most remote villages into the connected society, to solving pressing challenges around urbanization, ICT can have an impact on every one of the Sustainable Development Goals, and will provide essential infrastructure to help achieve them.

DiploFoundation points out that ICT deployment is not only vital to the digital economy but also plays a key role in innovation activities (2016). For developing countries in particular, ICTs offer the opportunity to 'leapfrog old technologies by skipping the intermediate stages of technological development'. VimpelCom also notes in its contribution that it is evolving to a more 'consumer-centric communications and technology company.' It argues that disrupting traditional business models is 'the only way to move the world closer to achieving the SDGs' (2016).

While developments pertaining to the IoT may impact the SDGs more generally, they are particularly relevant to innovation. APC, for instance, points out that continued innovation in the ICT sector pertaining to particularly IoT could have 'an important role to play' in meeting the SDGs (2016a) (as was also addressed in [SDG 7 above](#)). IoT, DiploFoundation argues, can provide policymakers and communities with valuable and timely information that is will become increasingly important for supporting many of the SDGs, including urban planning and saving public resources, for example. It will also fundamentally impact the traditional lines between digital and physical industries, promising 'a profound change to in the global economy' (2016).

The GSMA takes the view that rural-urban divides have to be addressed if SDG 9 is to be met. In this regard, it points out that third generation (3G) mobile broadband coverage, for instance, only covers about 29% of the rural population but extends to 89% of the world's urban population. It notes that the mobile industry in particular has a significant role to play in developing industry and providing critical infrastructure that can help other industries to develop (2016).

Reduced inequalities (SDG 10)

Summary of targets: Reduce inequality within and among countries

Inequalities within and among countries can be addressed by connecting and enabling more users, including through new opportunities for employment and income generation offered by and through various platforms (also addressed in [SDG 8 above](#)). As noted by GSMA, the Internet provides opportunities for low earners to increase their income by gaining access to digital economies; and can thereby accelerate progress towards reducing inequalities (2016a).

For example, a Kenya-based e-commerce tool, SOKO, enables local artisans in over 30 developing countries to participate in the global market place via their mobile phones. By submitting an entry form, vendor profile and product images via text message, producers can set up a storefront on SOKO's website and market their products to online consumers around the world. On average, after two months of joining SOKO, artisans increase their income fourfold (GSMA, 2016a).

To help address inequalities that exist among countries, Ogero Telecom notes the importance of ensuring that a country's interests are reflected and addressed in international decision-making forums (Lebanon, 2016).

Sustainable cities and communities (SDG 11)

Summary of targets: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

Contributors note that connecting and enabling users can help to make cities and human settlements more inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable by enabling more efficient sharing of information

pertaining to services and costs, by reducing administration costs, and by improving access to key areas such as health care, education and banking.

The Zimbabwe IGF notes in its contribution that access can help citizens to, for example, build sustainable smart homes using information they find online, and can also help with security solutions through Internet-monitored security systems (2016). Ogero Telecom argues that broadband and cloud solutions not only deliver e-government services but also help to provide opportunities for constructing smarter and greener buildings; and furthermore enable real-time road and traffic monitoring that can provide municipalities and traffic departments with vital information for the design of traffic and city services (Lebanon, 2016).

Fotjon Costa points out the importance of access in Albania, for instance, where the establishment of a digital archive in offices for immovable property registration has proven useful, along with the closed-circuit television (CCTV) monitoring of roads and crossroads (Albania, 2016). Samuel Guimarães Lima notes the importance of local municipalities and governments sharing vital information to make communities safer, more inclusive (e.g., through the sharing of opportunities pertaining to social programmes), and sustainable (Brazil, 2016).

Responsible consumption (SDG 12)

Summary of targets: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns

Connecting and enabling users can help to ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns by supporting better information management. As noted by Ogero Telecom, for instance, the use of cloud services could ‘dramatically affect resource use, both in in material and energy’ (Lebanon, 2016).

Climate action (SDG 13)

Summary: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts (also see SDG 7)

Contributors note that connecting and enabling users impacts climate change in both positive and negative ways. David Souter, for instance, notes that there are two sides to the ICT sector’s relationship with climate change (2016).

On the one hand, the ICT sector currently contributes about 2.3% of global greenhouse gas emissions. While this may not seem exceptionally large, the ICT sector's contribution is growing more than twice as fast as emissions from the rest of the global economy (Souter, 2016). Michael Oghia explains that it is not only the infrastructure and devices needed to enable access that contribute to climate change, but also the effects of its governance to some extent (Serbia, 2016c):

...to effectively govern a critical global resource means heavy reliance on air travel, which also contributes to about 2% of all greenhouse gas emissions.

On the other hand, however, the Internet and ICTs can also improve productivity in various other economic sectors, thereby reducing power consumption and carbon emissions (also discussed in [SDG 7 above](#)) (Souter, 2016). It can help to raise and improve user awareness of the importance of addressing climate change and teach them ways to reduce impact. For instance, in Poland, a library partnered with environmental experts and ecologists to design an interactive education programme on ecology and the environment, enabling more than 2,000 children to learn about environmentally-friendly lifestyles (IGF DC for Public Access in Libraries, 2016).

ICTs can also help to provide access to early warning systems. In Chennai, India, ICTs were crucial in assisting rescue efforts and relief work in the 2015/2016 floods (public comment response received by APrIGF, 2016b). GSMA also notes that the mobile industry, for instance, can support communities both before and after natural disasters by providing emergency broadcasting services as well as supporting the development and support of IoT-facilitated environmental monitoring, which enables the collection of data that is needed for managing climate change (2015; 2016b).

On a more general level, ICT solutions can also help to monitor climate change and planetary processes (c.f., Federal Telecommunications Institute, Mexico, 2016) and to address climate change through innovative solutions such as collaborative tools for smart grids, smart building, optimised logistics, and delivery services. The DC on Internet and Climate Change points out that the Internet acts as an important enabling technology to combat climate change by, among other things, helping to reduce emissions in other sectors (2009). The Global e-Sustainability Initiative (GeSI) has estimated that the potential impact of ICT-enabled solutions can be as much a 15% of total global carbon emissions per year (2010).

Besides the indirect carbon reduction benefits of broadband and ICTs, broadband-enabled ICTs like cloud computing (also discussed in [SDG 7 above](#)) also have potentially direct carbon reduction benefits. A Microsoft, Accenture and WSP study, for instance, indicates significant decreases in CO₂

emissions per user across the board for cloud-based versus on-premise delivery of three Microsoft applications studied (2010).

Initiatives such as the GeSI can potentially help to share important information and best practices on ways to address e-waste solutions by driving the 'ICT sustainability agenda' through tools such as GeSI's ICT Assessment Methodology, which provides guidance on the process of 'identifying and quantifying the carbon-reducing effects of implementing an ICT solution'. It is important, however, that all stakeholders gain a better understanding of how ICTs can benefit and support climate action in line with the SDGs. As GeSI notes (2010b):

ICT has tremendous potential to improve energy efficiency, cut carbon emissions and mitigate climate change. However, to understand and promote these benefits, merely implementing ICT solutions will not be sufficient—quantification of their impact is also critical.

Life below water (SDG 14)

Summary of targets: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development

Contributors note that meaningful Internet access can help to raise awareness of the importance of conserving and sustainably using the oceans, seas, and marine resources. Some contributions for instance point out that connectivity can help to monitor water flows, rain, snow, and winds, and to provide more effective early warning systems to protect species and fragile land areas, for instance.

Life on land (SDG 15)

Summary of targets: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss

Similar to the ways in which meaningful access can support and protect life below water, it can also enable the protection, restoration, and promotion of sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and biodiversity loss.

The Council of Europe notes that involving more citizens in science, especially through the use of web platforms, applications, and other Internet-based infrastructure and tools, can help to create new knowledge, provide data, and support informed decision-making in the environmental field – indirectly improving the planning of conservation actions (Council of Europe, Democratic Directorate Governance, 2016a):

Improving connectivity of the large public can support their engagement in citizen science, contribute to the monitoring of both terrestrial and marine ecosystems and thus support world efforts in halting biodiversity loss.

Peace and justice (SDG 16)

Summary of targets: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all, and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Contributors note that meaningful Internet access can help to promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development by, among other things, enabling and educating citizens to become increasingly engaged and enlightened, as well as to participate more directly in their communities, for example, through e-petition platforms.

The Council of Europe points out that online platforms enable ‘petitioning, policy initiatives, problem-solving and pooling of expertise and crowdsourcing applications which increase the transparency of political processes and decisions’. Citizen-driven movements have, however, also led to criticism about the true impact of online civic participation, along with concerns about the protection of users’ personal data, undue influence of voters’ opinions, and the proliferation of online hate speech (2016a).

On the other hand, applications can also provide solutions to challenges threatening inclusive and peaceful societies. In Egypt, the application HarassMap, for instance, crowdsources reports of sexual harassment using SMS and online reports, and then maps them online using the Ushahidi crowd-mapping platform. The map helps to illustrate the scale of the problem, raise awareness, and map potentially unsafe areas for women and girls in Cairo (Oghia, Serbia, 2016a).

Meaningful access is also important in the creation and sustenance of peaceful societies, as well as some countries’ transition to peaceful societies. As the DC for Public Access in Libraries points out,

communities in Colombia that have historically experienced severe violence are also often without Internet, voice or data networks. As a result, a social organization called MAKAIYA launched an initiative to use TV white space to connect such communities in order to facilitate meaningful access to complement peace processes (2016).

Increased access to information will also subject elected institutions to more scrutiny from engaged and empowered citizens, compelling such institutions to become more transparent and accountable (Council of Europe, 2016b). It can similarly help them save valuable resources (such as materials and administrative staff) and reach more citizens faster and more efficiently through e-government and other e-services. To promote e-voting and e-democracy, the Council of Europe notes that there is a need for agreed and enforceable rules at a global level pertaining to the rights and obligations of Internet companies in relation to 'their influence on political debate', the authentication of users, the protection of personal data, and the curbing of hate speech (2016a).

Because citizens may increasingly have to rely on online services, many contributors point out that it is important for governments and other stakeholders to support digital literacy development campaigns to ensure citizens are not left behind, as services are increasingly only available online. The Council of Europe, for instance, notes that educational measures are vital to support e-democracy (2016a). The DC for Public Access in Libraries points out that librarians are particularly well-equipped and positioned to, along with other stakeholders, provide users with the tools and skills necessary to not only access and peruse content but to also produce and share content (2016).

ICTs are also important in providing and sharing information that is vital to sustainable development, including raising awareness of human rights in a manner and using content that makes sense to local contexts and in local languages. Contributors point out that a better understanding of human rights may also help to counter abuse and violence both online and offline.

More generally speaking, contributors note that access to the Internet can help to decrease the costs of litigation and access to justice for all through the development of online services (e.g., online small claims courts, e-discovery, e-filing, or streamed court proceedings). In Albania, for instance, access to justice is facilitated through the digitization of court archives, the integration of various case systems and the development of web services linked to other governmental registers and actors (Costa, 2016). Meaningful Internet access can also enable more citizens to engage with justice and legal proceedings by learning more closely about legal proceedings through, for instance, following court reporting on social media platforms (as long as such reporting is fair, balanced, accurate and adheres to ordinary journalistic ethics/standards).

As the Council of Europe points out, however, various forms of (online) abuse and violence threaten ICTs' ability to positively impact the development of inclusive and peaceful societies. For this reason, it is also important that effective, accountable and inclusive institutions are developed to support sustainable development and protect human rights online (c.f., recommendations from the IGF [BPF Online Abuse and Gender-Based Violence 2015](#)). Where online forms of abuse and violence are concerned, for instance, law enforcement agencies (including police officers) and other members of the judiciary (including law clerks, magistrates, and judges) have to be trained to adequately and fairly prosecute and address the crimes and offenses that are enabled through ICT use in a manner that respects the privacy and other rights of victims. Similarly, national legislation needs to reflect and adequately address online forms of abuse, violence, and other offenses, including hate speech. (Council of Europe, 2016a).

Contributors also note the importance of providing wider institutional support for e-participation, as well. The Council of Europe points out that 'one of the biggest challenges' is to convince civil servants and political leadership to interact more actively with citizens, just as it might be difficult to convince 'disillusioned and sceptical citizens to use them' (Council of Europe, 2016b).

The UNHCR notes that connectivity can help refugee populations by enabling support and humanitarian agencies to provide security-enhancing services so that relevant information can be shared in a timely manner on websites, streamlining asylum processes, providing hotline services to support those in need, enhancing incident reporting and tracking, and ensuring female refugees' safety (2016).

Lastly, Ericsson stresses the importance of adequately measuring progress in the achievement of the SDGs, including by ensuring that all citizens have proof of legal identification (the need for which is expressed in SDG target 16.9), and notes that this right affects a citizen's right to vote, open a bank account, go to school or access health services, for instance. Moreover, digital identities can 'leapfrog analogue ID infrastructures and scale access to, and participation in, the digital economy (2015).

Partnerships for the goals (SDG 17)

Summary of targets: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development

Meaningful Internet access can provide tools for strengthening means of implementing the SDGs, and can also help to revitalise and catalyse the global partnership for sustainable development. As Ogero Telecom points out, it is vital that the importance of ICTs and Internet access as enablers for development be recognised and addressed in a consistent manner across various sectors, including education, health, and banking (Lebanon, 2016).

VimpelCom notes in its contribution that it believes that ‘companies should take the responsibility to act as engaged corporate citizens’ and that ‘large companies can serve as a platform, enabling individuals and entrepreneurs to be active participants rather than passive beneficiaries of the digital world’. It also highlights an incubator centre that supports local entrepreneurs, which was recently launched in Bangladesh with the support of VimpelCom and the Bangladesh government, as an example of such cooperation (2016):

This [centre] shows that by taking a broad approach to doing business, companies can be facilitators of bottom-up innovation in addition to delivering technological development top-down.

Ericsson argues that while many governments are ‘at least two to three technology cycles behind the technology frontier’, it is vital to raise awareness of the positive potential of ICTs in, for instance, delivering public sector services. It argues for not only better use of USFs, but also for more public-private partnerships and new business models that can help to bridge ‘the last mile of connecting the unconnected’. The role of policymakers in ‘mobilizing national collective action to leverage ICT for digital transformation’ is also stressed by Ericsson in its recent report on the role of ICT in supporting the SDGs (2016).

At the APriGF, the importance of multistakeholder coordination and collaboration to support the SDGs was furthermore stressed; including the need to share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources (2016a). The Council of Europe similarly takes the view that multistakeholder mechanisms are vital in reaching the SDGs. It argues that Internet governance needs to become ‘more democratic’ and that the establishment of a ‘multi-disciplinary framework for Internet governance and information society policy development and implementation’ could help to widen essential stakeholder participation and collaboration (2016b). In another recent report, GSMA takes the view that cooperation is crucial to realising the SDGs (2016b):

The SDGs are for all of us, in all our roles: for governments, public and private enterprise, society, and as individuals. Unlike the narrower scope of the MDGs, the SDGs create a common language for sustainability and provide a common framework for the ambition to create a better world.

PART B: LOCAL, NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SPECIFICITIES

Introduction

When the framework for Phase II of *Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)* was developed, various stakeholders emphasised the importance of investigating local, national, and regional specificities that are relevant when tackling connectivity challenges. Similarly, many contributions received in Phase II stressed the differences in access to and costs of broadband in developing and LDCs versus developed countries, along with the particular difficulties certain groups have in gaining access (e.g., women, the elderly, and/or disabled people) (e.g., ISOC, 2015), the impact of rural contexts (APC, 2016b), as well as other specificities. APC, for instance, points out that of the people who are not yet online, the vast majority derives from developing regions (2015a).

To gather more information on these specificities, NRIs in particular were [encouraged](#) in particular to submit input identifying local challenges and showcasing success stories in addition to general outreach in a call for input (see the [Methodology](#) for more details regarding the methods used to gather contributions). During a main session at IGF 2016, NRIs were also encouraged to give feedback on the challenge of meaningful access (IGF, 2016b). As far as was reasonably possible, such input has been summarised in this section where relevant.

In their contributions, many stakeholders reiterate the importance of taking local conditions into account in adapting policy options for connecting and enabling the next billion(s). For instance, a public comment received by the APrIGF when it gathered input for Phase II notes that ‘technology is not working in vacuum, the same with the Internet. It depends on many factors and how you connect is also important’ (2016b). Mexico’s Federal Telecommunications Institute similarly points out that each country has ‘its own peculiarities, complexities and challenges’ which have to be considered when developing and implementing recommendations and strategies (2016). Furthermore, APC also stresses in its contributions that ‘there is no “one-size-fits-all” solution’ to connecting and enabling the next billion(s) (2016a) and that ‘local conditions vary considerably from country to country’ (2015a).

In compiling this part of Phase II, contributions were analysed for commonalities and differences with the aim of identifying themes relevant to and important for adapting, developing, and implementing policy options for connecting and enabling users at diverse levels. These themes are

not only potentially useful to local communities and policymakers, but also to investors and the variety of initiatives currently addressing digital divides.

Important factors, characteristics and/or themes that were extracted from contributions, as well as the ways in which these factors, characteristics and/or themes can inform local, national and regional initiatives aimed at addressing connectivity, are discussed in this section. At the day-zero feeding session organized by ICANN, ISOC, IEEE, ITU, Global Connect, UNESCO, the World Bank, and WEF, for instance, seven themes of challenges to access in all regions were highlighted, including challenges pertaining to taxation barriers; the need to support digital capacity-building, starting at school level; the enabling role of governments in supporting access growth as opposed to access control; the need to support and promote investment in backhaul/last mile connectivity; the need for better spectrum management, including unused frequencies; the need to close the gender gap, and the need for stimulating relevant and local language content to bolster adoption rates (IGF, 2016a).

This section then leads into [Part C](#) below, which highlights lessons for future implementation and the development of policies, initiatives, programmes, and/or strategies aimed at connecting and enabling the next billion(s) at local, national, and regional levels.

Overview: gaining a comprehensive understanding of local contexts

In developing policy options at local, national and regional levels, it is vital to first determine the demands and unique needs of every location and every community in a location are. The South Eastern European Dialogue on Internet Governance (SEEDIG), for instance, notes that (2016):

When it comes to building policies for bridging the digital divide, the first step that needs to be undertaken is a comprehensive analysis of the real situation, based on accurate and reliable data. Such data would then constitute the basis for developing policies that are targeted at addressing the specific problems identified.

This understanding relates to challenges pertaining to both the supply side as well as demand-side challenges. Supply-side challenges include the demands specific to a location itself by virtue of certain geographical characteristics, the nature and quality of existing infrastructure, and the general investment environment in existence, which also includes market conditions and the legal and regulatory framework concerned. Demand-side challenges include the need for local content and

cultural aspects that will influence and possibly determine the particular demands of a community. While these and other factors are discussed in separate sections below, many of them are closely related and/or interlinked, and should neither be considered nor addressed in vacuum.

Meeting real needs in a transparent, open manner

One of the most common themes in the contributions received in Phase II relate to the need for governments, policymakers and other stakeholders to properly **consider communities' and people's priorities and needs** when attempting to address connectivity challenges (c.f., Central Africa IGF, 2016).

Michael Oghia stresses that 'it is critical to know what the needs of a local population are' (Serbia, 2016b); while Anthony Namanga refers to experiences in his own country to emphasise the importance of taking into consideration culture when developing connectivity and other policies. He notes that some people in Cameroon do not want to be connected because of religious beliefs and customs, for instance (Cameroon, 2016). Said Zazai points out that meeting needs and raising awareness of what the Internet can offer users are vital elements to connecting and enabling the next billion(s). He argues that local initiatives tend to have an organic, home-grown approaches that meet the needs of users better than 'foreign' or external approaches (Afghanistan, 2016).

A recent report by GSMA and LIRNEasia in Myanmar on gender, mobile phones and the Internet similarly indicates the importance of cultural norms and stereotypes in determining certain population groups' access to and use of the Internet. The report shows that women are 29% less likely to own a smartphone than men in Myanmar due to a combination of reasons, including low income and traditional gender roles. Men in the country tend to have a more prominent role in households 'based on the religious belief that only men can become a Buddha'; while many women took this situation so for granted that they did not consider it to be 'discrimination' (2015).

Regulatory or policy strategies to aid Internet access should be developed and planned through, as APC notes, 'extensive **public consultation** which include all stakeholder groups – national and regional government structures, private sector and civil society' (2016a). Kim Lilianne Hendi similarly stresses the importance of engaging networks and other stakeholders in the process of designing and implementing policies and programmes, 'especially in rural and remote areas'. She argues that such engagement procedures increase opportunities for the policies to be adopted and

to have long-term effects, and notes that among other things, success in implementation occurs when design ‘included the promotion of meaningful use and application’, ensured initiatives’ continuity and sustainability, and also duly consulted with local experts in the process (Canada, 2016).

Data collection, particularly on usage as well as user perceptions and preferences, also needs to be **transparent** (DiploFoundation, 2016; Oghia, Serbia, 2016b). Furthermore, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi stresses the importance of properly and transparently communicating about policy initiatives and proposals before implementation (Nepal, 2016). In its contribution, DiploFoundation, furthermore, recalls surveys conducted by the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee (CGI.br) on the use of ICTs in households, by companies, and in the education sector in Brazil; noting that such surveys were successful in gathering ‘sound information about the evolution of the Internet, helping policymakers to protect its future’ (2016).

Lastly, **best practices** should be shared as part of the drive to communicate better with all stakeholders in respect of plans and initiatives. Mexico’s Federal Telecommunications Institute, for instance, has recently instituted reforms that, among other things, led to the creation of an ‘Infrastructure Deployment Microsite’ to ‘compile and disseminate information related to the regulations at different levels’ in order to raise awareness and promote the development of local digital projects (2016).

Mapping the relevant terrain

Rural areas, dense forests, mountainous areas and small island states face particular challenges in addressing connectivity challenges because the deployment and maintenance of certain types of infrastructure to and through such terrains are often technically challenging (DiploFoundation, 2016; GSMA, 2016a; APriGF, 2016a; APC, 2016b). Samuel Guimarães Lima explains that in Brazil, for instance, the local army has to be used to install optical fibre in certain areas, including the Amazon basin region (Brazil, 2016). Said Zazai similarly notes that countries in rugged mountainous areas, especially in the Himalayas, or small islands scattered all over the Pacific, face particular deployment challenges rendering Internet access expensive (Afghanistan, 2016).

A background contribution from ISOC notes the importance of **terrain and geographical location** in Africa in particular. In 20 countries studied in ISOC’s contribution, 16 countries are landlocked and can ‘by definition not benefit directly from submarine cable landing station’. These countries, ISOC

notes, can 'benefit from the presence of (multiple) cables landing in different neighbouring countries, by owning a stake in a cable landing station in a neighbouring country, through improved terrestrial connectivity, and by developing a virtual cable landing station at their border' (2013).

Besides terrain, GSMA points out that **climate** – particularly high humidity levels and violent events such as storms – can detrimentally impact satellite signals as well (2016a). The **size** of a country is also important, as smaller and lower-income countries will be less likely to offer competitive markets for potential investors (APC, 2016a).

Similarly, **population density** in the area concerned also impacts connectivity. GSMA argues that in order for a site to be viable for building mobile towers, for instance, it needs to have approximately 3,000 active daily users. But, as GSMA also points out, rural areas represent more than 90% of the earth's land surface with population densities often below 100 people per square kilometre (GSMA, 2016a). SEEDIG notes that in Slovenia, for example, government intervention was needed to expand telecommunications networks to many rural areas that were not attractive from an investment perspective due to the high costs involved in expanding infrastructure (2016).

Despite these challenges in reaching particularly rural and remote areas and landlocked and island countries, the APrIGF argues that significant progress has been made in Asia Pacific countries, for instance. Not only have innovative approaches been generated, particularly in providing last mile connectivity, but it is hoped that initiatives like the Asia-Pacific Information Superhighway (AP-IS) project will significantly support the availability and affordability of ICTs in the region (2016).

On the other hand, APrIGF also expresses concerns about the Asia Pacific region's increased exposure to natural disasters as a result of climate change. It points out that ICTs can help to manage the risks of such disasters, and that it is important to therefore ensure the development of resilient infrastructure that can continue to support communities when natural disasters occur (2016).

Taking stock of existing infrastructure

It is also important to understand the nature and quality of infrastructure, as well as the 'current state of connectivity' in the country or region concerned (Federal Telecommunications Institute, Mexico, 2016). Existing infrastructure is closely related to terrain, as geopolitical and geographic factors are critical to determining the location of **IXPs**, content delivery networks (CDNs), and traffic hubs, which

in turn help to create competitive markets in the vicinity of such locations (APC, 2016a), as well as to develop more local content (APrIGF, 2016) (c.f., the IGF [BPF on IXPs](#) for more information). A country's readiness to transition to **IPv6** is also important in implementing long-term solutions to access (SEEDIG, 2016) (c.f., the IGF [BPF on IPv6](#) for more information).

Other contributors point out that not only existing broadband capacities in a location should be considered but also other basic infrastructure such as the availability of reliable electricity, safe and passable roads, and public buildings (c.f., APrIGF, 2016a; GSMA, 2016a; Oghia, Serbia, 2016a). Connectivity's (current) reliance on other infrastructure (including electricity grids, access roads, etc.) means that stakeholders addressing connectivity challenges should do so in a holistic, future-focused manner. As GSMA, for instance, notes with specific reference to mobile operators working in certain parts of Africa and Southeast Asia that often suffer from a lack of basic infrastructure (2016a):

Mobile operators must, as a result, build each site in a self-sufficient manner adding to the up-front deployment costs and ongoing operations and maintenance costs.

Current and future **demands** also need to be more thoroughly investigated. Ogero Telecom, for example, notes in its contribution that an action plan was recently developed by the Lebanese Ministry of Telecommunications in conjunction with Ogero Telecom in response to 'huge' demands created by big data; 'knowing that this project will attract foreign investments into Lebanon while contributing to economic development and providing job opportunities'. Among other things, this plan consists of replacing existing copper cables with fibre networks and improving mobile technology by optimising fourth generation (4G) networks (2016).

As Ogero Telecom notes, the Lebanese Ministry of Telecommunications 'took into consideration the current situation of the local Lebanese market', the emergence of new mobile networks, as well as increasing demand on Internet bandwidth. While the plan includes various components, some highlights include the reduction of communication tariffs on local, international and mobile calls along with a 'sharp decrease' in Internet service fees, which has resulted in an increase in Internet penetration in Lebanon from 70% in 2013 to 86% in 2015 (2016).

Understanding the market and general investment environment

Another important consideration in addressing access needs is how **competitive** a market is – i.e. the extent to which operators and investors can participate freely in a market without, for instance,

being encumbered by incumbent operators. Market dominance also naturally also affects availability, cost and quality of service; and, in some regions, incumbents are likely to be protected by governments to the detriment of the market (APC, 2016a).

For example, the Federal Telecommunications Institute of Mexico notes that the country's telecommunications market was historically characterised by 'high monopolistic concentration that caused services with low coverage, poor quality and high prices' which, in turn, 'limited the exercise of freedom of expression and the right to information' of citizens, 'as well economic, social and cultural development' (2016).

To address these shortcomings, a constitutional reform enacted in 2013 confirmed among other things that 'telecommunications and broadcasting are public services of general interest' and that Mexico shall 'guarantee the right of access to [ICTs]', including the Internet. The reform also allowed structural changes in the local markets due to the creation of a more enabling environment 'for the establishment of solid and reliable regulatory policy through the creation of the Federal Telecommunications Institute'. Changes included allowing foreign direct investment (FDI) of up to 100% in telecommunications and satellite communications, and up to 49% in broadcasting. The objective of this reform, which aims to expand networks through 'public, private or mixed investment' is to increase the coverage and quality of telecommunications services and to promote competitive prices. In 2015, private investment in Mexico grew almost 35% in 2015, while FDI in Mexico grew from 1% before the reform to 10% in 2015 (Federal Telecommunications Institute, Mexico, 2016).

In another example, the government of Romania specifically aimed to create enabling environments for investment in infrastructure, particularly in underserved areas. Besides the provision of physical access, other initiatives in the country have supported Internet use through, for instance, public libraries equipped with computers and broadband access, and librarians have been trained to support local communities in using the Internet (SEEDIG, 2016).

In an African context, furthermore, a study by ISOC notes that although there might have been significant improvements in Africa's Internet connectivity levels, 'investments have not always translated into a corresponding improvement in the Internet access services experienced by users, through lowered prices or increased quality of service'. ISOC argues that policy remedies are need to 'remove roadblocks for new market entry and expansion', to 'promote investment by providing clear rules' and, lastly, to 'provide strong leadership' to meet connectivity goals in Africa (2013).

In addition to indicating that local competition regulation is important for allowing new entrants and investors, contributors to Phase II also highlight how other factors are needed to establish regulatory frameworks. These include factors such as how onerous **licensing** for Internet service providers (ISPs) is, whether a country allows innovative **spectrum** usage and spectrum re-farming, and to what extent **infrastructure sharing** is allowed (c.f., GSMA, 2016a; SEEDIG, 2016; Facebook, 2016; APC, 2015a, 2016a; ISOC, 2013; A4AI, 2016a). In respect of infrastructure sharing and with specific reference to mobile operators, GSMA underscores that (2016a):

...mobile operators are increasingly adopting alternative methods to network coverage expansion, notably infrastructure sharing and partnerships with other ecosystem players, to complement traditional network deployments.

Furthermore, GSMA notes that there are various models of infrastructure sharing available, and selection depends on ‘a range of factors including the prevailing regulatory environment, market characteristics and individual operator strategies’. It also takes the view that infrastructure sharing models often obviate the need for public subsidies and/or development funding and can thus have ‘a profound, positive impact on the economics of network expansion into rural and remote areas’ while preserving competition and commercial sustainability (2016a).

APC similarly argues that infrastructure sharing is a good way of maximising private investment to extend telecommunications networks and reduce their costs (2015b); and refers to research that shows that in developing countries specifically, infrastructure sharing can ‘save billions’ (2015a):

These savings can be obtained both through sharing telecom infrastructure (such as ducts, fibres and masts) as well as sharing with other utility infrastructure such as roads, power grids, fuel pipelines and rail lines (these are often also called linear, passive or alternative infrastructure). In urban environments water supply and sewage systems can also provide sharing opportunities.

APC takes the view that ‘the level of **institutional development** of the policy and regulatory agencies needs to be first taken into account in determining where resources first need to be applied’ (APC, 2016a). Moreover, Said Zazai notes that the extent to which a local government realises and supports the need for enabling access, also in the form of relevant policies, is vital to how attractive a market is for foreign or local investment (Afghanistan, 2016).

The APrIGF also notes that **digital economy and trade** offer much in terms of the development of the global economy, but will only be successful if investment and regulatory environments are

supportive of the free flow of information – a point that is echoed by the Pan-European Dialogue on Internet Governance (EuroDIG) in its submission (2016). The APrIGF argues that close collaboration is needed among all stakeholders to ensure that a network of free trade agreements will require ‘member states to maintain the free flow of information and to ensure the prohibition of data localization as well as source code disclosure unless there is a legitimate public policy reason’ to allow an alternative. Where multilateral free trade agreements are concerned, the APrIGF takes the view that ‘necessary mechanisms’ should be incorporated into such treaties to ensure that the ‘further development of digital economy for developing countries is not compromised in any way’ and to include ‘offsetting measures that provide a level playing field’ to all stakeholders (2016a).

Lastly, the Central Africa IGF is concerned that in countries like Cameroon, Chad, Congo-Brazzaville and the Democratic Republic of Congo, some ‘crucial questions’ pertaining to infrastructure development and the related regulatory policies were not understood properly by ‘most policymakers’; enabling private organisations to benefit from an ‘unstructured environment’ to the detriment of users (Central Africa, 2016).

Ensuring that access is *meaningful*

APrIGF points out that Internet access does not automatically translate into meaningful use (discussed in more detail in [Part A](#) of this resource). On the contrary, it is vital as well as greatly needed to address demand-side challenges – such as affordability, awareness, and digital skills, the availability of relevant content and services, security, privacy, and trust – as well as address underlying cultures and norms that affect access (2016a).

While most of the considerations pertaining to meaningful access discussed in [Part A](#) are applicable in local contexts, it is also important to consider how meaningful access is regarded in specific regions. This extends from the quality and speed of access itself to the availability of relevant content, the ability to use content, the extent to which human rights are promoted and respected online, and whether women and marginalised groups are able to benefit from meaningful access.

A contribution from SEEDIG, for instance, points out that there are ‘many layers’ of Internet development in the Southeastern European region, and that the deployment of infrastructure ‘is insufficient in itself’. Instead, it needs to be complemented by measures focused on **education and development of local content**, among other things (2016).

A background contribution from ISOC notes that Internet availability now ‘far outpaces adoption’ and that there is a need to place a greater emphasis on the demand by facilitating local content availability and distribution. ISOC notes that in the countries it studied in Africa, the majority of content is hosted outside the country and typically overseas. For instance (2016a):

[I]n Rwanda, for all .RW websites, only a very small fraction are hosted in Rwanda, and the rest are hosted predominantly in Europe and the US. Based on work that we did recently in Rwanda, overseas hosting can have a significant impact on the cost and latency of accessing the content, which acts to depress usage.

The language that content is available in is also critical to increasing Internet adoption. The Broadband Commission points out that only about five percent of all existing languages are accessible online (2016b). Said Zazai similarly underscores the importance of **local content** and the use of **local language** in creating demand for Internet among more in the Asia Pacific region (Afghanistan, 2016). ISOC stresses the need for ensuring the existence content in languages that are not widespread on the Internet (2015) – including, for example, in Sub-Saharan African countries whose populations are not always comfortable with or fully fluent in the official government language (ISOC, 2016c).

At IGF 2016, the Armenia IGF also highlighted the importance of creating quality content in local language to preserving national identity – not only for people in Armenia, but also for Armenian diaspora around the world (IGF, 2016b). At the same session, the APriGF furthermore noted the importance of localisation to the creation of local content; and argued that while the deployment of IPv6 and internationalised domain names may support access, it is ‘very important that explicit measures are taken to support, conserve and enhance their uniqueness, language and cultural diversity’ (IGF, 2016b).

SEEDIG notes the importance of promoting multilingualism and the availability of relevant content in local language in its submission with specific reference to internationalised domain names (IDNs). Noting that **IDNs** ‘are seen not only as a tool for potentially bringing people online, but also a way of reflecting national identity’, it points out that various countries in the region have already or are in the process of introducing IDN country code Top-Level Domains (ccTLDs). In Serbia, for example, the use of IDNs to reflect the diversity of languages and scripts used by the country’s recognised national minorities is also being explored. To enable universal acceptance of IDNs, however, SEEDIG recommends ‘extensive and continuous cooperation between the technical community, the private sector, and, to some extent, public authorities’ (2016).

Like many other contributors, Mexico's Federal Telecommunications Institute acknowledges that while some progress has been made in expanding levels of access, more needs to be done to ensure that the potential of the Internet and other ICTs' potential for sustainable development be realised. One way in which it aims to do so in Mexico is by granting concessions for community and indigenous social use with the aim of promoting local culture and language, and supporting wider citizen participation, including the participation of traditionally marginalised groups (Federal Telecommunications Institute, Mexico, 2016).

EuroDIG similarly stresses the importance of creatively meeting the needs 'of all minorities' to facilitate meaningful access. It argues that the private companies and governments share responsibility to help design commercial solutions to promote access, while governments, it notes, have the duty to 'enable full enjoyment of human rights online for all users' (2016).

The APrIGF also emphasises the importance of **human rights** as being 'central' to the Internet, and notes that topics related to the protection and promotion of human rights online were the subject of 'intense scrutiny and debate by all stakeholders' at the annual APrIGF meeting in 2016. It points out that network shutdowns and blocking, for example, not only have 'serious economic consequences' but also impede the free exercise of human rights online (2016a).

The APrIGF also takes the view that when legislation that was designed to govern offline spaces is used with newer legislation aimed at online conduct and behaviour, human rights must remain protected. States should also 'be urged to reconsider' mutual legal assistance agreements (MLATs) are implemented to ensure that the right to privacy, access to justice and the rule of law are upheld when individuals' data is shared with states. Furthermore, information about data requests must be available to the public 'for the interest of transparency and accountability' (2016a).

The APrIGF furthermore highlights the importance of enabling multistakeholder collaboration (addressed in more detail [below](#)) to develop effective regulatory frameworks and to protect freedom of expression, the free flow of information, and ensure the protection of children and youth online from illegal and harmful content. It proposes the adoption of the three-pronged test of legality, legitimacy and proportionality in shutting down or interrupting access, investigation and/or prosecution in all participating countries (2016a).

While 'expectations of privacy may vary' between and among cultures and regions, protection mechanisms must not only meet internationally recognised measures to protect privacy, but 'the highest level of protection should be guaranteed as a default safeguard'. This, the APrIGF argues, will

enable the protection of privacy despite differing levels of protection in diverse jurisdictions and the ‘general lack of user awareness’ (2016a). EuroDIG similarly highlights the fact that Internet freedoms vary among countries. As Thorbjørn Jagland, Secretary General of the Council of Europe, noted at EuroDIG’s annual event in 2016:

Different countries, including in Europe, employ different approaches, meaning that, currently, how free and open your Internet is depends on where you live. And these imbalances are something the Council of Europe is trying to correct.

Moreover, APrIGF argues that the **right to be forgotten** should ‘be approached with caution’ as challenges pertaining to its extraterritorial and practical application must be balanced with applicable rights; and it argues that emerging jurisprudence on the topic ‘imposes a burden on proving public interest’ on both people searching for data and the entities facilitating such searches, including intermediaries. In respect of the latter, it also points out that intermediary liability needs to be addressed to enhance the use of the Internet; and notes that while more work needs to be done on implementation, the Manila Principles provide a useful framework for addressing intermediary responsibility.

The need for serving the needs of oft-**marginalised groups** that are less likely to benefit from access was also highlighted during the main session on NRIs at IGF 2016. Mary Uduma from the Nigeria IGF, for instance, explained the way in which this national IGF initiative identified under-connected groups, including women, youth, elderly people, people with disabilities, and rural dwellers. It investigated challenges pertaining to accessibility, affordability and availability for specifically these groups – including the ways in which government and other stakeholders in Nigeria can support meaningful access for these groups (IGF, 2016b).

The **gender** digital divide is also highlighted by APrIGF in its submission, including not only access and affordability, but also ‘persistent disparities in literacy and income’, various barriers related to social and cultural norms, and online abuse and gender-based violence. In respect of the latter, the APrIGF notes that online threats:

...limit women’s ability to take advantage of the opportunities that ICTs provide for the full realisation of women’s human rights, act as a barrier to access that can exacerbate the gender digital gap, violate women’s human rights, and reproduce gender stereotypes and discrimination.

To address gender-based abuse and violence online, the APrIGF recommends multistakeholder action ‘through a range of strategies from the framework of human rights, including capacity-building, more effective complaints and redress mechanisms, inclusive decision-making processes, and/or appropriate legislative and policy-based responses’ (2016a) (discussed in more detail [below](#)).

During a main session at IGF 2016 dedicated to the NRIs, the Armenia IGF, for instance, also gave feedback on the ways in which it, along with the local ISOC chapter, has created an Internet radio station to help support and integrate people with **disabilities**, including by informing visually impaired people of their rights and privileges, problems and solutions, new opportunities and success stories (IGF, 2016b).

EuroDIG notes in its contribution that enabled users are users that can also take responsibility for online activities. Outputs from one of its workshops include that access is also about ‘informed consent, related **skills and education**, and therefore having the capacity to fully participate online’. To this extent, EuroDIG takes the view that there is a need for media literacy training in formal and informal settings, as well as education to ensure that human rights are both understood and respected online (2016).

Said Zazai also stresses the importance of basic literacy for enabling meaningful Internet access, noting that literacy levels and Internet use have a ‘direct correlation’. He similarly notes the importance of digital skills to make better use of the Internet and to enable entrepreneurial activities online; thereby supporting the SDGs (Afghanistan, 2016). Findings from 1 World Connected in case studies from both North America and Africa confirm this argument, and further point to the need for digital literacy to ‘go beyond’ basic ICT training to teaching users to use the Internet for specific outcomes, such as applying for a job, or getting help for homework, in order to be truly meaningful (2016). Additionally, SEEDIG confirms the importance of digital literacy in improving access and use in Southeastern Europe, and explains that various initiatives aimed at improving literacy are underway in the region (2016):

In Georgia, for example, the government, in partnership with civil society organisations, is delivering training to local communities, with the aim to educate individuals on how to use the Internet in a meaningful way.

Promoting trust and security to ensure meaningful access

EuroDIG takes the view that the only way in which the Internet will be beneficial, or meaningful, is if it is also 'free, open and secure', with **trust** being 'key in embracing the digital revolution'. At EuroDIG's annual event in 2016, the need for better collaboration between industry and governments to ensure trust and privacy was stressed (2016). As Günther Oettinger, the European Union Commissioner for Digital Economy and Society, European Commission, noted at EuroDIG:

Trust is indeed key in embracing the digital revolution... The data initiative along with new Data Protection rules are examples of how the European Union can contribute to boosting trust so as to ensure that citizens and companies can fully benefit from the digital revolution.

EuroDIG argues that in understanding and defining cybersecurity, the focus should be both on the end user as well as on the technical community and local justice departments. Intermediaries, it argues, 'cannot be the cheap police of the Internet' by substituting states' responsibility to act responsibly in protecting human rights (2016).

The importance of trust is also emphasised by the Croatia IGF, which notes that national cybersecurity and the protection of minors, for instance, are key elements of a new national cybersecurity strategy and related action plan adopted by the Croatian government in 2015. As the Croatia IGF points out, '[u]sers need to be comfortable to use services offered via [the] Internet' (2016). The Central Africa IGF similarly stresses the importance of issues related to the safe and stable operation of Internet infrastructure, including cybersecurity and the management of unsolicited communications (spam) (2016).

In its contribution, the APriGF notes that **cybersecurity** 'is critical not just to the stability of cyberspace, but also increasingly important to the physical world'. It argues that collaboration is needed both within and beyond the Asia Pacific region to mitigate and prevent cybersecurity incidents; and that emerging technologies such as IoT, more advanced artificial intelligence (AI), and machine-to-machine (M2M) communication will pose new security considerations and challenges that should already be addressed from the design stage of related devices (2016a). It recommends that legal and regulatory frameworks pertaining to cybersecurity, data protection, surveillance, anonymity, intermediary liability and cybercrime must uphold and protect human rights, which is discussed in more detail in the next section.

Enhancing multistakeholder collaboration

APrIGF notes in its contribution that the multistakeholder model in Internet governance ‘encourages coordination and planning through a consensus-making process and recognizes the need to incorporate regional and local Internet governance context and strategies’. It argues that the model should ‘form the basis of policy-making processes and initiatives which are inclusive, transparent and accountable to all stakeholders’ (2016a). ISOC takes the view that cooperation among stakeholders ‘will be crucial in formulating development strategies and programmes that bring together development priorities and the potential of the Internet’ (2015). A4AI also notes in its *Affordability Report 2015/16* that an integrated approach to policymaking is required to ensure universal access (2016a):

Getting everyone online requires balanced policies that address demand as well as supply; regulation as well as competition; fixed-line broadband as well as mobile; public access as well as consumer affordability. This demands cooperation across ministries, between geographic units (local, state and national), and among private sector stakeholders, whose business interests may be very different.

Various contributors to Phase II also emphasise the importance of **public-private** collaboration in supporting connectivity drives, although consideration should also be given to the private sector’s economic/financial capacity to engage in such partnerships. Government incentives can help, some contributors point out, to help connect areas that are not economically viable for most private institutions to serve (DiploFoundation, 2016). The APrIGF similarly notes that ‘combined input’ from all sectors is needed to create innovative business models that support sustainable initiatives and have the ability to solve challenges pertaining to affordable access and the promotion of digital literacy, among other things (2016a). Furthermore, the Croatia IGF argues that multistakeholder national IGF initiatives are also important in supporting the expansion of meaningful access and Internet governance more broadly (2016).

A joint report by ISOC and Analysis Mason on barriers to connectivity in Africa furthermore stresses the importance of **high-level leadership** to promote investment and remove roadblocks (2013). This need is echoed by A4AI, which notes that government ministers and others must ‘spearhead efforts to convene all actors and develop a clear, coherent plan for sequencing reforms and stimulating the investments needed to enable reduced costs and wider access’ (2016a). Noting that

markets with higher prices and lower levels of Internet use ‘tend to be characterised by barriers and obstructive government involvement in the sector’, ISOC points to certain examples where government interference jeopardises development (2013):

[The] Ivory Coast operates a monopoly on the international gateway; incumbent operators in Cameroon and Botswana remain state-owned; and crossing borders in Southern Africa has been described as bureaucratically challenging.

Furthermore, DiploFoundation notes that the support of **civil society** as a form of bottom-up social organisation, as ‘focal points’ and as ‘disseminators of capacity-building initiatives at local level’ is similarly important for the development of policy options for connecting and enabling new Internet users. Civil society could also help communities ‘self-organise to tackle some of their connectivity problems’, it argues, and refers to the creation of community networks as an example of such self-organisation (2016).

Further research and some concerns

Some contributors lament the apparent lack of **research** being conducted to identify how appropriate technologies and Internet connectivity can effectively contribute to sustainable and inclusive development at local levels in specific regions. A public comment received by the APriGF, for instance, notes that while the SDGs provide significant focus areas for development in regions such as the Pacific, and ICTs and connectivity ‘could be a major contributor to this development’, there is a lack of adequate research being done to specifically identify how appropriate technologies and Internet connectivity can effectively contribute to development at local levels (2016b). ISOC similarly notes the need for sex-disaggregated data and to support policy research in order to better understand the barriers men and women face in terms of Internet use (2016b).

Besides the need for more rigorous research, some contributors also express concern about the nature of some private initiatives to encourage connectivity and the need to ensure that such initiatives to expand access do not come at the cost of **net neutrality** and the **free flow of information**. DiploFoundation, for instance, argues that the use of drones (e.g., Facebook’s [Project Aquila](#)), balloons (e.g., Google’s [Project Loon](#)), and certain **zero-rating** practices have ‘raised concerns about limiting access to a designated number of Internet platforms/services, which would accelerate a “walled garden” Internet’ (2016). GSMA, on the other hand, argues that governments

should consider supporting ‘multi-sided business models as zero-rating and sponsored data’ to enable, more particularly, successful rural infrastructure sharing projects (2016a). Facebook similarly takes the view that zero-rating amounts to ‘innovative business arrangements that promote connectivity and economic development’ by giving ‘more people more access to more content’ (2016).

The APriGF also points out that while ‘ubiquitous technologies’ like the **IoT** and the availability of fast broadband may support the development of new knowledge and information societies, they also create new digital divides ‘as they skew benefits further towards those who already have access to the necessary skills and resources’. It consequently emphasises the need to take ‘explicit measures’ to ‘support, conserve and enhance’ users’ ‘individual and collective uniqueness, their language, geographic and cultural diversity’ (2016a).

PART C: CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

A draft version of this resource was presented and discussed during a main session on *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)* and other intersessional activities at the 11th IGF, held from 6 to 9 December 2016 in Guadalajara, Mexico (see IGF, 2016c). During this session, Phase II's work received broad approval from the IGF community. It was noted that *Policy Options* had become both a tangible and useful output for policymakers and other stakeholders as well as a symbol of the IGF community's conviction that expanding meaningful Internet access is a common and shared goal that is fundamental to the future of Internet governance.

Stakeholders emphasised that more work needs to be done to better understand the role of ICTs in general and the Internet more specifically in supporting efforts towards achieving the SDGs (discussed in more detail in [Part A](#) of this resource). Noting that there is currently a relative shortage of measurement data on barriers, means, and types of access, the need to continue to gather information and stories on the Internet's role in supporting the SDGs was stressed, along with the need to encourage the input of development experts in discussions pertaining to these themes.

Stakeholders furthermore also noted the importance of context – including the vital differences in designing approaches that are suitable for promoting meaningful access in diverse regions – in discussions pertaining to connecting and enabling more Internet users (discussed in more detail in [Part B](#) of this resource). The need for more and rigorous work to be done to gather detailed case studies of initiatives aimed at addressing access challenges at local, national, regional, and global levels was also stressed by stakeholders.

Some stakeholders noted that *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion(s)* has already become a useful resource in its relatively brief history; illustrating how the IGF is able to provide a useful platform for mobilising stakeholders towards solving complex problems using a multistakeholder approach. Various stakeholders pointed out that their respective organizations had found the resource to be useful in their own work in the field, and would continue to value the opportunity for multistakeholder collaboration offered by the IGF, particularly when addressing the challenge of connecting and enabling more Internet users. It was noted that there is a need for the IGF to continue providing such a platform in the future, possibly as part of a third phase in this intersessional activity's work.

PART D: APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Original contributions and background reading

All original contributions are also listed and uploaded in full to the [IGF's website](#) (submission tab).

Note that the acronym [OC] following a citation denotes an original contribution, including responses to the call for input that either contained generic comments or contained responses to the questions in the call for input are indicated. Background contributions, meaning contributions of existing reports or other background reading of potential significance to Phase II's work, are indicated with the acronym [BC].

1 World Connected. (2016). (contribution to CENB Phase II). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/182. [Accessed 18 November 2016].

Alliance for Affordable Internet (A4AI) (2016a). *Affordability Report 2015/6*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/60. [Accessed 12 October 2016].

A4AI (2016b). *Africa's Future in a Connected World, Keynote address of Dr. Omobola Johnson (chairperson of A4AI) at TechPlus 2016*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/64. [Accessed 12 October 2016].

A4AI (2016b). *Realising Affordable Internet in Bangladesh*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/63. [Accessed 12 October 2016]. [R27d] [BC]

African IGF (2016). *Draft Outcome Document*. Available at: http://afigf.org/sites/default/files/2016/docs/REPORT%20AFIGF%202016%20Draft%20outcome%2018102016_evening_rev1.pdf. [Accessed 18 November 2016].

Albania government/Fotjon Costa (2016). (responses to questions in call for input). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/46. [OC]

Association for Progressive Communications (APC) (2016a) (responses to questions in call for input). Available: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/52. [OC]

APC (2016b). *Ending digital exclusion: why the access gap persists and how to close it*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/54. [Accessed 11 October 2016]

APC (2015a). *APC Written Inputs for the Expert Group Meeting on Advancing a Sustainable Information Society for All. 8-9 June 2015*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/53. [Accessed 11 October 2016]

APC (2015b). *Unlocking broadband for all: broadband infrastructure sharing policies and strategies in emerging markets*. Available at: <https://www.apc.org/en/system/files/Unlocking%20broadband%20for%20all%20Full%20report.pdf>. [Accessed 11 October 2016]

Asia Pacific Regional Internet Governance Forum (APrIGF) (2016a). (*contribution in response to call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/73. [OC]

Asia Pacific Regional Internet Governance Forum (APrIGF) (2016b). (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/74. [OC]

Broadband Commission for Sustainable Development (2016a). *The State of Broadband Report 2016: Broadband catalysing sustainable development*. Available at: <http://www.broadbandcommission.org/Documents/reports/bb-annualreport2016.pdf>. [Accessed 12 October 2016].

Broadband Commission for Sustainable Development. (2016b) *Working Together to Connect the Next 1.5 Billion by 2020*. Report on the Special Session of the UN Broadband Commission for Sustainable Development at the Annual Meeting of the World Economic Forum. Available at: <http://www.itu.int/pub/S-POL-BROADBAND.16-2016>. [Accessed 18 November 2016]. [R40] [BC]

Central Africa IGF (2016) (*contribution in response to call for input*) (incorporating submissions from Cameroon, Chad, Congo-Brazzaville, and the Democratic Republic of Congo) (2016). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/39. [R8] [OC]

Cerf, V. (2016) (*comment on IGF review platforms*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/189.

Colombian National IGF Initiative (2016) (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/186 [R51] [OC]

Council of Europe (2016) (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/67. [R14a] [OC]

Council of Europe: Democratic Directorate Governance (2016a) (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/51. [R14b] [OC]

Council of Europe (2016b) (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/67.

Croatia IGF (2016). (*contribution in response to call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/41. [R10] [OC]

Dan, C. (2016) (*comment on IGF review platform*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/189.

DiploFoundation (2016) (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/30. [R2] [OC]

Ericsson/ Colombia University Earth Institute. (2016). *How Information and Communications Technology can Accelerate Action on the Sustainable Development Goals*. Available at: <https://www.ericsson.com/res/docs/2016/ict-sdg.pdf>. [Accessed 21 November 2016]. [R47] [BC]

Facebook (2016). (*contribution in response to call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/59. [R26] [OC]

Federal Telecommunications Institute (Mexico) (2016) (English version) (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/77. [R19b] [OC]

Federal Telecommunications Institute (Mexico) (2016) (Spanish version) (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/50. [R19a] [OC]

GeSI (2010). *Smart 2020: Enabling the low carbon economy in the information age*. Available at: <http://gesi.org/files/Reports/Smart%202020%20report%20in%20English.pdf>. [Accessed 11 October 2016]. [R32] [BC]

GeSI & BCG (2010b). *Evaluating the carbon-reducing impacts of ICT: An assessment methodology*. Available at: http://gesi.org/files/Reports/Evaluating%20the%20carbon-reducing%20impacts%20of%20ICT_September2010.pdf. [Accessed 10 October 2016] [R31] [BC]

GSMA (2016a) (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/32. [R3a] [OC]

GSMA (2016b). *Mobile Industry Impact Report: Sustainable Development Goals*. Available at: <http://www.gsma.com/betterfuture/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/ UN SDG Report FULL R1 WEB Singles LOW.pdf>. [Accessed 21 November 2016]. [R48] [BC]

GSMA (2015a). *Connected Women 2015: Bridging the gender gap: Mobile access and usage in low- and middle-income countries*. Available at: http://www.gsma.com/connectedwomen/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/GSM0001_02252015_GSMAReport_FINAL-WEB-spreads.pdf. [Accessed 1 October 2016]. [R3b] [BC]

GSMA & LIRNEasia (2015b). *Mobile phones, internet, and gender in Myanmar*. Available at: http://www.gsma.com/mobilefordevelopment/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/GSMA_Myanmar_Gender_Web_Singles.pdf. [Accessed 1 October 2016]. [R3c] [BC]

Guimarães Lima, Samuel (2016). (*contribution in response to call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/58. [R25] [OC]

Hazas, M.; Morley, J.; Bates, O. & Friday, A. (2016). *Are there limits to growth in data traffic? On time use, data generation and speed*. Available at: <http://limits2016.org/papers/a14-hazas.pdf>. [Accessed 10 October 2016]. [R29] [BC]

Hendi, Kim Lilianne (2016). (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/48. [R17] [OC]

Horrigan, J.B (for Comcast). (2015). *Deepening Ties: Comcast Internet Essentials Customers Show Broader and Deeper Ties to the Internet over Time – Especially Among those who had Digital Literacy Skills Training*. Available at: <http://corporate.comcast.com/images/comcast-ie-report-2-horrigan.pdf>. [Accessed 18 November 2016]. [R50] [BC]

IGF (2016a). *Session summary from Day 0 event at IGF 2016 in Guadalajara, Mexico: Advancing Solutions for Connectivity: Improving Global Coordination and Collaboration*. Session video and transcript available at: <http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/igf-2016---day-0---room-3-global-connect-ieee-isoc-itu-unesco-wef-and-the-world-bank>. [Accessed 24 December 2016].

IGF (2016b). *Session summary from Main Session on National and Regional IGF Initiatives at IGF 2016 in Guadalajara, Mexico*. Session video and transcript available at:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/igf-2016-day-2-plenary-hall-national-and-regional-igfs>. [Accessed 24 December 2016].

IGF (2016c). *Session summary from Main Session on Intersessional Activities at IGF 2016 in Guadalajara, Mexico.* NOTE: Session video still awaited by IGF Secretariat as at 4 January 2017.

IGF. (2016). *Code of Conduct.* Available at: <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/aboutigf/igf-code-of-conduct>. [Accessed 26 September 2016].

IGF BPF Gender and Access (2016) (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/142. [R28] [OC]

IGF (2015). *Outcome documents: Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion.* Available at: <http://intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/connecting-and-enabling-the-next-billion-phase-i>. [Accessed 22 September 2016].

IGF Dynamic Coalition for Public Access in Libraries (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/68. [R5] [OC]

IGF Dynamic Coalition on Community Connectivity (2016a). *Outcome Document on Community Connectivity.* Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3737/174. [R42] [BC]

IGF Dynamic Coalition on Community Connectivity (2016b) (*contribution in response to call for input*). Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/187. [R43] [OC]

IGF Dynamic Coalition on Internet and Climate Change (2009). *Statement on Climate Change and the Internet.* Available at: <http://www.itu.int/themes/climate/dc/docs/second-meeting/DCICC-Statement.pdf>. [Accessed 10 October 2016]. [R30] [BC]

ISOC (2016a). *Promoting content in Africa.* Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/57. [Accessed 6 October 2016]. [R24c] [BC]

ISOC (2016b). *Outcome Document of the Asia-Pacific Regional Internet and Development Dialogue on building a sustainable future through an inclusive Internet in Asia and the Pacific.* Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/187. [Accessed 17 November 2016]. [R24e] [BC]

ISOC (2015). *The Internet, an Opportunity for Sustainable Development.* Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/56. [Accessed 6 October 2016]. [R24b] [BC]

ISOC (2013, May). *Lifting barriers to Internet development in Africa: suggestions for improving connectivity.* Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/55. [Accessed 6 October 2016]. [R24a] [BC]

ITU & UN Women (2015). *Action Plan to Close the Digital Gender Gap.* Available at: <http://www.itu.int/en/action/gender-equality/Documents/ActionPlan.pdf>. [Accessed 2 October 2016]. [R36] [BC]

ITU (2016a). *ICT Facts and Figures 2016.* Available at: <https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Documents/facts/ICTFactsFigures2016.pdf>. [Accessed 20 October 2016].

ITU (2016b). *The results of our Open Consultation on Building an enabling environment for access to the Internet*. Available at: <http://www.itu.int/en/council/cwg-internet/Pages/open-consultations.aspx>. [Accessed 18 November 2016]. [R41] [BC]

Jensen, M. (2016). *(comment on IGF review platforms)*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/189.

Microsoft, Accenture & WSP (2010). *Cloud Computing and Sustainability: The Environmental Benefits of Moving to the Cloud*. Available at: <http://gesi.org/files/Reports/Cloud%20Computing%20and%20Sustainability%20-The%20Environmental%20Benefits.pdf>. [Accessed 11 October 2016]. [R33] [BC]

Namanga, Anthony (2016). *(responses to questions in call for input)*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/31. [R1] [OC]

NetHope (2016). *SDG Playbook: From Innovation to Impact*. Available at: <http://solutionscenter.nethope.org/toolkit/view/sdg-ict-playbook-from-innovation-to-impact>. [Accessed 20 November 2016]. [R49] [BC]

Ogero Telecom (2016) *(responses to questions in call for input)*. Available: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/38. [R7] [OC]

Oghia, Michael (2016c). *The Internet's Climate Quandary and the Inconvenience of Practicing What We Preach*. CircleID. Available: goo.gl/bRhoY6. [Accessed 10 October 2016]. [R4c] [BC]

Oghia, Michael (2016) *(responses to questions in call for input)*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/33 and http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/34. [R4a, 4b] [OC]

Pan-European dialogue on Internet governance (EuroDIG) (2016). *(contribution in response to call for input)*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/42. [R11] [OC]

Parker, S.H. (2016) *(comment on IGF review platforms)*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/189. [OC]

Rahman, Z. (2016). *(responses to questions in call for input)*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/201. [OC]

Raju, Kanumuri S. (2016). *(contribution in response to call for input)*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/181. [R44] [BC]

Rayamajhi, Shreedeeep (Ray Z News) (2016) *(responses to questions in call for input)*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/36. [R6a] [OC]

Saldanha, Marcelo (2016). *(contribution in response to call for input)*. Available at: http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/44. [R13] [OC]

Souter, David (2016, October 10). *Inside the Information Society: meeting the climate challenges of ICTs*. APC (blog). Available at: <https://www.apc.org/en/blog/inside-information-society-meeting-climate-challen#>. [Accessed 11 October 2016]. [R38] [BC]

South Eastern European Dialogue on Internet Governance (SEEDIG) (2016). (*contribution in response to call for input*). Available at:

http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/78. [R21] [OC]

UN Economic and Social Council (2012, March 16). *Report of the Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum* (A/67/65-E/2012/48). Available at:

http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/a67d65_en.pdf. [Accessed 8 October 2016].

UNESCO (2015). *Connecting the Dots: Options for Future Action (Outcome Document)*. Available at:

http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CI/CI/pdf/outcome_document.pdf. [Accessed 11 October 2016]. [R37] [BC]

UN (2016). *The Sustainable Development Agenda*. Available at:

<http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/development-agenda/> [Accessed 22 September 2016].

UN General Assembly (2015, October 21). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Resolution A/Res/70/1)*. Available at:

http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E [Accessed 22 September 2016].

UNHCR (2016). *Connecting Refugees: How Internet and Mobile Connectivity can Improve Refugee Well-Being and Transform Humanitarian Action*. Available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/connectivity-for-refugees.html>.

[Accessed 11 November 2016]. [R46] [BC]

Uruguay IGF (2016). (*contribution in response to call for input*). Available at:

http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/40. [R9] [OC]

VimpelCom (2016). (*contribution in response to call for input*). Available at:

http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/43. [R12] [OC]

Web Foundation (2015). *Women's Rights Online Translating Access into Empowerment*. Available at:

http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/62. [R27e] [BC]

Web Foundation (n.d.). *Closing the Digital Divide: A Briefing Note*. Available:

http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/61. [R27b] [BC]

World Bank (2016). *World Development Report 2016: Digital Dividends*. Available: http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2016/01/13/090224b08405ea05/2_0/Rendered/PDF/World0developm0000digital0dividends.pdf. [Accessed 11 October 2016]. [R22] [BC]

WSIS (2005, November 18). *Tunis Agenda for the Information Society (WSIS-05/TUNIS/DOC/6(Rev. 1)-E)*. Available at: <http://www.itu.int/net/wsis/docs2/tunis/off/6rev1.html>. [Accessed 8 October 2016].

Zazai, Said (2016). (*contribution in response to call for input*). Available at:

http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/49. [R18] [BC]

Zimbabwe IGF (2016) (*responses to questions in call for input*). Available at:

http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/index.php?q=filedepot_download/3416/47. [R16] [OC]

Appendix 2: Framework document

Final Draft

IGF 2016 COMMUNITY INTERSESSIONAL PROGRAMME

Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion – Phase II

v. 27 June 2016

MAG volunteers: Julian Casasbuenas G., Wisdom Donkor, Alejandra Erramuspe, Miguel Estrada, Segun Olugbile, Renata Aquino Ribeiro, Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro

Introduction

The 2012 [report](#) produced by the United Nations (UN) Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) working group on Internet Governance Forum (IGF) improvements called for the development of more tangible IGF outputs to “*enhance the impact of the IGF on global Internet governance and policy*”. Given this, the IGF multi-stakeholder advisory group (MAG) launched a new intersessional programme in 2015 with the intent to extend and increase the impact of other IGF activities, such as NRIs, Dynamic Coalitions (DCs) and Best Practice Forums (BPFs).

Over 70 [submissions](#), including 22 from national and regional IGFs, contributed to the development of a set of [Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion](#) that were presented at IGF 2015 in João Pessoa, Brazil, in November 2015.

The outputs from this intersessional programme are intended to be a dynamic resource and evolve and grow over time. With this in mind, the MAG decided in April 2016 to explore further developing the IGF “*Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion*”, including an inclusive invitation to the NRIs for their contributions detailing certain national and regional specificities, including challenges and relevant developments.

Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion – Phase II

The UN Agenda for Sustainable Development identifies information and communication technologies (ICTs) and the Internet as horizontal enablers for development. Paragraph 9-c. sets an important goal for the international community, namely to:

“Significantly increase access to information and communications technology and strive to provide universal and affordable access to the Internet in least developed countries by 2020”

Given ICTs and the Internet are so important to development, it is critical that policy options and strategies be tailored to local needs and specificities.

The first phase of the IGF intersessional project *Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion* (2015) focused on developing a set of policy options aiming at the creation of enabling environments, including:

- Deploying **infrastructure**;
- Increasing **usability**;
- Enabling **users** (e.g., through ICT literacy and training tools); and
- Ensuring **affordability**.

In 2016, it is proposed to further develop these policy options by **emphasizing local and regional specificities**:

- For example: level of market and digital policies development, competition environment, capacity-building, technical infrastructure, access to information and content, cybersecurity, etc.
- The NRIs could be invited to contribute to identifying local challenges and to showcasing success stories.

With a view to **demonstrating how *Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion* contributes to reaching the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**

- While all of the SDGs are equally important to consider, some (like, for example, affordable connectivity and access to infrastructure, the cross-cutting use of ICT tools, digital literacy and skills, and capacity-building) can be viewed as building blocks to support other SDGs.

- Examples of success stories in using the Internet to address real world problems in least developed and developing countries should be inclusive of examples in e-government, e-agriculture, e-health, e-education, e-innovation and e-commerce; of how ICTs could be used to empower women and girls; the importance of the mobile industry to connectivity in developing regions; as well as other innovations in areas facing pandemics, such as use of high-speed Internet in fighting Ebola.
- Limitations, barriers to entry, and examples of what has not worked well would also be observed.
- As far as possible, tangible checklists could be developed to provide a framework of considerations for the implementation of each of the SDGs that potentially relate to connecting and enabling the next billion.

To enhance the impact of the IGF's work, it is also proposed to:

- **Build strategic alliances with key players at all levels:** global, regional, national, local: development workers and communities, World Bank, International Telecommunication Union (ITU), UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), CSTD, regional commissions, European Union (EU), African Union Commission, NEPAD, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), Association for Progressive Communications (APC), Web Foundation, GSMA, LIRNEasia, other civil society organizations; International Chambers of Commerce (ICC), relevant ministries and national agencies of education and health, local governments, NGOs, etc.
- **Build strategic alliances with key non-governmental initiatives:** 2030 SDGs, Global Connect Initiative, Alliance for Affordable Internet, WEF Internet for All initiative, etc. The strategic alliance could also deal with innovative funding mechanisms.

Modality

- To identify policy options for “*Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion – Phase II*”, rounds of online public consultations will be conducted (with versions in local languages as far as is

reasonably possible). Following the example of the [BPFs](#), an open and bottom-up process is envisioned to collect input.

- Initial contributions in Phase I will be analysed with the aim of identifying commonalities and differences across submissions. This should prevent the need for duplicate submissions by stakeholders, and will strengthen the current resource.
- Interested NRIs, DCs, and BPFs will be invited, among others, to contribute by sharing success stories or by proposing additional options to support *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion – Phase II*.
- Draft outputs will be produced and further discussed, both online and during the IGF 2016 ([6-9 December, Jalisco, Guadalajara, Mexico](#)) during a main session. Once compiled, the output will be made available to/shared with relevant fora at all levels, e.g., UN Technology Facilitation Mechanism, High-Level Political Forum, World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) Forum, NRIs, DCs, BPFs, etc. This output will also serve as input to the IGF community in order to decide on a theme for the 2017 IGF community intersessional work.

Timeframe

- July – open-ended: Launch public call for background contributions on the theme of “*Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion – Phase II*”. Contributions will be gathered and ultimately incorporated in the output through an iterative process.
- July: Invitation to the MAG/ IGF community to join open editorial group.
- Sept: First draft “*Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion – Phase II*” open for public comment through web platform and reviewed by open editorial group.
- Oct.: Second draft open for public comment through web platform.
- Nov.: Final draft output published on IGF website.
- Dec.: Presentation and discussion of the “*Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion – Phase II*” during IGF meeting.

- Post-IGF: "*Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion – Phase II*" incorporates input from IGF 2016 in Mexico; published and shared with relevant fora at the international, regional and local level. Documents/work space continue to evolve (based on support and value).

Appendix 3: Call for input

Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion – Phase II:

Call for Public Input

11 July 2016

Introduction

In 2015, over 70 [submissions](#), including 22 from national and regional IGF initiatives (NRIs), contributed to the development of a set of [Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion](#) that were presented at IGF 2015 in João Pessoa, Brazil, in November 2015.

The first phase of the IGF intersessional project *Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion* (2015) focused on developing a set of policy options aiming at the creation of enabling environments, including deploying infrastructure, increasing usability, enabling users and ensuring affordability.

In April 2016, the MAG decided to explore further developing the IGF “*Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion*”.

Phase II (2016): Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion

The UN Agenda for Sustainable Development identifies information and communication technologies (ICTs) and the Internet as horizontal enablers for development. Paragraph 9-c. sets an important goal for the international community, namely to:

“Significantly increase access to information and communications technology and strive to provide universal and affordable access to the Internet in least developed countries by 2020”

Given ICTs and the Internet are so important to development, it is critical that policy options and strategies be tailored to local needs and specificities. In 2016, it is proposed to further develop the 2015 *Policy Options* by emphasizing local and regional specificities and by demonstrating how *Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion* contributes to reaching the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Learn more about this initiative

Read the full outline framework document, including a more detailed description, explanation of modalities, and timeline, [here](#).

Guidelines for background contributions

All stakeholders are invited to submit contributions on the theme “*Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion*”. Contributions from NRIs, best practice forums (BPFs), dynamic coalitions (DCs), and IGF workshops are particularly welcome.

What format should my feedback be in?

Contributions are preferred in Microsoft Word, but should as far as possible be supported by links to studies, reports, references, statistics, etc. and are expected to be of reasonable length in order to maximize readability. Additional templates may be developed to aid contributions if this is deemed helpful.

What will happen to my contribution?

All contributions will be published on the IGF’s website and will be analysed and incorporated into the outcome document for *Policy Options for Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion*, as far as is deemed possible and relevant by the editorial group of volunteers. All contributors’ details will be credited in the outcome document, and contributions may be published on the IGF’s website.

What is the deadline for contributions?

While we would appreciate input by 31 July 2016, we will continue to receive contributions on a rolling basis until 31 August for the first draft.

To facilitate the participation of national and regional IGF initiatives (NRIs) that might only host their respective events later this year, no deadline has been prescribed for NRIs.

Who do I send my feedback to?

Email contributions should be sent to Anri van der Spuy (avanderspuy@unog.ch) and Brian Gutterman (gutterman@un.org).

What if I have more questions?

For further queries, or for more information, please contact Constance Bommelaer (bommelaer@isoc.org), the coordinator of this initiative.

Proposed questions to guide your response:

While inputs of any format will be considered for incorporation, a suggested format could include bullet points addressing some or all of the following questions:

1. How would you define, or how do you understand, the theme “*Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion*”?
2. The first phase of *Connecting and Enabling the Next Billion (2015)* identified a set of policy options aimed at the creation of enabling environments, including deploying infrastructure, increasing usability, enabling users, and ensuring affordability. What are the factors to consider when adopting these policy options at local levels (e.g., the state of a country’s market development, the available infrastructure, level of capacity-building, etc.)?
3. Are you aware of any specificities around connectivity at a local or regional level? (In other words, do you know of factors that impact connectivity in, for instance, rural areas but less so at an urban level? Or factors that affect connectivity at regional or larger scale, but not as noticeably at local or smaller scale?)
4. Data shows that the growth of Internet adoption is slowing down in some areas, especially as broadband services extend to more remote, less densely populated areas (facing challenges beyond affordability and availability).¹³ What are some of the barriers or limitations preventing people who *do* have Internet access from being enabled or empowered through such connectivity?
5. What does *meaningful access* mean?

¹³ Broadband Commission (2015). *The State of Broadband 2015*. Available online: <http://www.broadbandcommission.org/documents/reports/bb-annualreport2015.pdf>.

6. How can connectivity contribute to reaching the new SDGs?
7. Do you know examples of stories where using ICTs to support development has not worked, and why?
8. Can you think of ways in which ICTs or Internet connectivity could be used to help reach the SDGs?
9. Do you know of examples of success stories that can illustrate how Internet access can help to address real-world problems (in either developed or developing countries)? For example, do you have stories or experiences to share regarding some or all of the following SDG-related questions:
 - How can connecting and enabling users help **to reduce poverty** in its various forms? (SDG 1)
 - How can connecting and enabling users help to **end hunger, achieve food security and support improved nutrition**? (SDG 2)
 - How can connecting and enabling users help to **promote sustainable agriculture**? (SDG 2)
 - How can connecting and enabling users help to ensure **healthy lives** and to promote **well-being** at all ages? (SDG 3)
 - How can connecting and enabling users help to ensure inclusive and equitable, quality **education**? (SDG 4)
 - How can connecting and enabling users help to promote lifelong **learning opportunities**? (SDG 4)
 - How can connecting and enabling users help to achieve **gender equality**? (SDG 5)
 - How can connecting and enabling users help to **empower women and girls**? (SDG 5)
 - How can connecting and enabling users help to ensure the availability and sustainable management of **water and sanitation**? (SDG 6)
 - How can connecting and enabling users help to ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern **energy**? (SDG 7)

- How can connecting and enabling users help to promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable **economic growth**? (SDG 8)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to promote full and **productive employment**? (SDG 8)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to ensure **decent work**? (SDG 8)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to build resilient **infrastructure**, promote inclusive and sustainable **industrialization** and foster **innovation**? (SDG 9)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to **reduce inequality** within and among countries? (SDG 10)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to make **cities** and human **settlements** inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable? (SDG 11)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to ensure sustainable **consumption and production** patterns? (SDG 12)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to combat **climate change** and its impacts? (SDG 13)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to conserve and sustainably use the **oceans, seas** and **marine resources** for sustainable development? (SDG 14)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to protect, restore and promote sustainable use of **terrestrial ecosystems**, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss? (SDG 15)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to **promote peaceful and inclusive societies** for sustainable development? (SDG 16)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to provide access to **justice** for all? (SDG 16)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to build effective, accountable and inclusive **institutions** at all levels? (SDG 16)

- How can connecting and enabling users help to strengthen the means of **implementation** (SDG 17)
- How can connecting and enabling users help to revitalize the **global partnership** for sustainable development? (SDG 17)