IGF 2016 Report

Session Title	Shaping the Future of Internet Governance – An Open Dialogue between Pioneers and Young Leaders
Date	09/12/2016
Time	Part 1: 11:30 a.m. – 01:00 p.m. | Part 2: 3:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
Main Session Organizers	Flávio R. Wagner, MAG member, technical community Liesyl Franz, MAG member, government Bianca Ho, MAG member, civil society, young leader Ephraim Kenyanito, MAG member, civil society, young leader Thiago Tavares, CGI.br and Safernet, civil society Nathalia Sautchuk, CGI.br advisory team, technical community Kimberly Anastácio, Youth Observatory/ISOC, civil society Marcel Leonardi, Google, private sector
Chair/Moderator	Honorary Chair: Yolanda Martínez, Government, MX Hartmut Richard Glaser, CGI.br, Technical Community, BR Thiago Tavares, CGI.br and Safernet, civil society, BR
Rapporteur/Notetaker	Angélica Contreras, Mujeres Construyendo, Civil Society, MX Vinicius Wagner Oliveira Santos, CGI.br/NIC.br, Technical Community, BR
Remote Moderator	Nathalia Sautchuk Patrício, CGI.br/NIC.br, Technical Community, BR
List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations	PIONEERS Anriette Esterhuysen (APC, ZA) Stefano Trumpy (ISOC Italy, IT) Raúl Echeberría (ISOC, UY) Vint Cerf (Google, US) Hiroshi Esaki (University of Tokyo, JP) YOUNG LEADERS Bianca Ho (DotKids Foundation, HK) Grace Abuhamad (NTIA, US) Kimberly Anastácio (University of Brasília, BR) Ephraim Kenyanito (AccessNow.Org, KE) Florian Daniel (Youth Ambassador, InSafe, AT)
Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):	1. What lessons learned by pioneers and youngsters in their historic involvement with Internet governance are relevant to inform discussions between generations? 2. What are the perceived challenges, obstacles and possibilities for

	meaningful youth engagement, participation and impact in IG events and related initiatives?
	3. What are the desired and needed modes of documenting the historic record to better inform technical and policy decisions in the future?
	4. What are the desirable modalities of capacity development for the empowerment of future generations to join Internet governance discussions and policy-making processes on an equal footing with senior stakeholders?
	5. What sorts of synergies between different generations are necessary to enable an inclusive Internet as a means for sustainable growth and development around the world?
If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each Presentation	There were no specific presentations. Moderators conducted the session following a Q&A format.
Please describe the Discussions that took place during the Main Session: (3 paragraphs)	The five main issues of the session were raised in the form of policy questions. Hartmut Glaser – the Moderator – introduced each of them, opening the floor for a 10-minute unmoderated dialogue directly between two speakers: one pioneer and one young leader.
	The first policy question was approached by Grace Abuhamad and Vint Cerf. Grace asked Vint about his field experience with youth insertion in Internet Governance debates, asking if they generically collaborate to the field or if they in fact bring confusion to the process. Vint recalled that he also had been young once, so, given the role he played since then, he corroborated the idea of the youth having space to create and build things together with the main characters of the field. The debate went on with both participants talking about inflection points in history. Vint remembered the roles of the pioneers and made a parallel with Internet history, stating that people must know this history so as not to repeat the mistakes made. The dialogue ended with a broader reflection on the diversity of participation in the field, not just from the perspective of age, but also thinking about areas and fields of expertise.
	The second policy question was approached by Anriette Esterhuysen and Florian Daniel. Florian reported how he started his involvement with Internet Governance and about his difficulty with the bunch of acronyms which are part of the Internet Governance realm. He also highlighted the challenge to acquire knowledge, how to acquire and

what to do with that. Anriette expressed some concerns about the general idea of simply allowing the youth to participate right away in policy discussions. She spoke about the timing for participation in the discussions. She said that it is necessary to develop an overarching process, a journey of knowledge acquisition, maturation, before the youngsters may influence the field itself. She also argued that the insertion has to maintain the characteristic of being relatively generic, without putting young people, at first, in the mid of political tensions and allowing them to take part in ultimate decisions. She also reinforced that youngsters must find out what are the topics that mobilize them so as to focus in this journey of knowledge with ulterior influence in the field. Florian finalized agreeing with Anriette and introducing the Youth Coalition.

The third issue – Documentation to inform policymaking – was raised by Hartmut, highlighting the Friends of IGF (FoIGF) program, which is being supported by CGI.br and has the main goal of preserving the memory of global IGF meetings. The topic was explored by Hiroshi Esaki and Ephraim Kenyanito. Both of them reinforced the need for documenting history and taking care of the memory of policy debates. Hiroshi stated that he has also understood the relevance of the historic record in his daily interaction with students, which he considered a privilege in terms of learning. Hiroshi also considered other topics such as the Internet infrastructure, multistakeholderism and bottom-up processes. Ephraim focused on the bottom-up processes issue and underscored the fact that this is one aspect in which young people need the collaboration of the pioneers, so that they can engage and participate. Ephrain also drew a parallel between the relevance of documentation and the information/knowledge seeking journey of the youth, revealing the importance of projects such as FoIGF, Wikipedia and ICANN wiki.

The fourth policy question dealt with the issue of capacity development and was approached by Bianca Ho and Raúl Echeberría. Bianca started talking about how she has been engaged with the IGF agenda since she was 19, being now at her sixth IGF. She highlighted the importance of the pioneers and other active members of the field in helping and supporting the insertion and maturation of newcomers, new voices, especially young people. She asked Raúl about his visions on that and on the next steps that could contribute to the enhancement of such interactions. Raúl agreed with Bianca and reinforced the need for mentoring programs, inclusion and engagement of new people, establishing what he called "virtuous cycles of young people insertion". Those cycles could support and enable the youth to participate more and more in different Internet governance tracks. Raúl also remembered that it is necessary to have a continuous preparation and supporting process, so that young people are not merely thrown in the middle of ongoing discussions and policy processes without having the possibility of meaningful participation. Raúl stated that current initiatives of youth engagement

	are good but are not enough and that it is necessary to ask the youth how they want to be engaged, letting them choose the best forms for this process to be conducted and to happen. In conclusion, Bianca called upon participants for more space for young people to express their opinions, something endorsed entirely by Raúl. He then reinforced the notion according to which dealing with disruptive things such as Internet and its technologies demands growing disruption, disruptive people and inventions. The last policy question raised dealt with synergies between different generations, and was discussed by Stefano Trumpy and Kimberly Anastácio. Stefano started the debate saying that Kimberly belongs to the digital natives group – people that came to the world with the Internet already posing in a central and focal point, while the pioneers generation had to pass through a total invention period. Stefano talked about his insertion starting in 1995 with an Information Society project. He asked Kimberly about her opinions on multistakeholder governance and the collaboration among diverse people and areas of expertise. Kimberly reinforced the challenge to define the youth as a cohesive group and added that it is even more difficult to represent such a diverse group. She also pondered the youth insertion, highlighting how people are accessible to talk, saying that the Internet governance world is sort of welcoming. However, she also stated that it's not enough to assume that everything and everybody is integrated, there's still too much to enhance in that dialogue. Kimberly asked Stefano how he sees and compares himself today and in the beginning of his insertion in the field, having in mind, for example, the space given for youth to engage in the processes. Stefano finalized his participation by pointing out to the youth and saying: "be inventive as much as possible", making it clear that it is very much necessary to understand the system complexity, instead of just staying focused on specialized assessments of the field. Kimberly referred to different youth initiatives and then advanced some ideas surrounding the possibility or not of trying to change the system from inside.
Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways: (3 paragraphs)	*Improvement of education and capacity building*. Bianca and Florian considered education and capacity building processes. Especially, they focused on university training. Florian talked about this context in his country, Austria, stating that courses dealing with Internet Governance still represent a limited group, which in Austria is also something quite regional. Bianca argued that in the University people learn how to learn, and not necessarily the expert content itself. She highlighted the need of insertion and immersion in the field. Other people argued that there is plenty of space for different areas of knowledge and expertise to contribute to Internet Governance. *The importance of legitimacy*. Grace considered the issue of legitimacy. In this sense, she argued that legitimacy comes with time and insertion in the field. She described how many people supported her through time and how this helped the process of consolidation of

	legitimacy for her playing a role in the Internet Governance debates. She also reinforced the importance of having institutional backing and supporting for people involved in these spheres. *The pressure in important policy decisions.* It was raised by the audience and by other speakers the issue of being part of very important decisions, and the weight that presses people in these moments. Stefano said that this must not be a problem at first and that it is not something exclusive of Internet governance. He also highlighted, in this sense, the role of humanities in the field, analyzing and understanding processes in a broader manner. Grace finalized, building upon Stefano's words, by stating that Internet governance is not that ready and automated process as it may look like: it is a great and complex system.
Other important remarks	There were other important comments made by on-site participants and also by remote participants, as summarized below: The need for actions to improve the comprehension and awareness of Internet governance, in local, regional and global levels. The issue of parental control was raised in the context of the discussion about child protection and content blocking, calling for education of parents. There was a statement urging that work be done within society so that people understand the culture of new technologies. There were also other interventions reinforcing the need for more youth participation in various spaces, including the MAG, as well as questions regarding the use of the Internet by young people.