

FINISHED FILE

APrIGF 2017

"ENSURING AN INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN ASIA
PACIFIC: A REGIONAL AGENDA FOR INTERNET GOVERNANCE"

BANGKOK, THAILAND

JULY 27, 2017

ROOM 202

EVOLVING AN OPEN E-GOVERNANCE INDEX FOR NETWORKED SOCIETIES

11:30 AM

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> ALAN ALEGRE: We'll try to start soon because we have a lot of ground to cover. Maybe those at the back, it's okay for you to come in front. Thank you. Starting within five minutes.

>> ALAN ALEGRE: Good morning, friends. Thank you for coming to this session. It's a session on a five-country study we are concluding on Evolving an Open e-Governance Index for Network Societies. My name is Al Alegre. I am from the Philippines. I represent the Foundation for Media Alternatives, which is the main proponent of the study, and who coordinated this study with four other partners in four countries. There is a bit of technical issues here, but we'll try to -- because it's an Internet conference, so of course we'll have problems technical, right?

So let me do the introduction. What will happen is I will give maybe an eight to ten-minute overview of the research and

the project, and then we are going to ask three of our partners, three of the five partners, Asian partners, because the other two are not Asian. Two are here, Indonesia and Philippines. One will try to come in via remote participation from Pakistan, and then we've also invited a participant to the research, but you want to get -- she's Ritu from India, who will give a perspective on their own study on digital exclusion, because we have a part on digital inclusion.

So in the spirit of sort of peer review, we want to listen to how they're working on their digital exclusion index and see if it can improve the Open e-Governance Index.

Are we ready?

So anyway, let me -- I have the slides in front of me, so even though it's not projecting -- and I apologize if the translators will find it hard to follow, but in the interest of time, I'll introduce the Open e-Governance Index, or OeGI, and then three countries, highlight their national assessments. Indonesia, Indriyatno Banyumurti of ICT Watch will come in. He's at the left, left-most. Philippines, Lisa Garcia of Foundation for Media Alternatives will be next. If Pakistan can come in, he'll come in, Shazhad Ahmad of Bytes for All, who I guess you know. And then India, Ritu Srivastava of the DEF, Digital Empowerment Foundation will come in.

Our schedule is very tight because we just have one hour, and we want 15 minutes for open forum. So we said that we'd do seven or eight minutes and we will cut the mic at ten minutes. So people should not talk more than ten minutes, then we'll have an open forum.

Are we set yet? Not yet. Okay.

I will introduce OeGI. First, the background and rationale. I think we started discussing this coincidentally when the APrIGF was born, around 2010. 2009, 2010. We were wondering how the internet and ICT is impacting the main drivers of development, which is politics and governance. So is there really an impact of ICT enabled network societies? Is it really possible that ICTs lead to more democracy, especially in Asia, because it started in Asia. And then we get all sorts of concept of openness. Some of it, or voices like openness in terms of freedom of information. Yeah? There's a long tradition of free and open source software. Release often and all buds are shallow. Everybody benefits, right?

So, we were wondering, is openness now becoming a normative value for democracy? Participation, and development? So what we are sort of now reflecting upon, it's a mash-up of different discourses. It was a discourse of rights, human rights, communication rights, free and open Internet, freedom of information, Internet rights, digital rights. It's a mash-up of governance concepts, and you know the early iterations of this were transparency, accountability, citizens' participation in governance. Yeah? And also the discourse of technology's role

in society. Web 2.0 is coming into its own. Open ecosystems are being started where there was open spectrum, open content, open culture, open source. Yeah?

So what we wanted to do was to have a measure of that. Okay, sorry about the screen. I was just going to flash several of the index systems we studied. Brown University, participation index, readiness, ICT development index. We studied all of that. And our concerns are covered by any index system, and we said, they apparently are not yet covered. So we said that it might be worth doing a new indicator system, because the old ones focus more on -- well, like e-readiness, is it more infrastructure, or use of IT by governments or by businesses, and this is the example we were grappling with before. Any government survey in the region or maybe globally, Singapore is always at the top, right? Who is from Singapore here? Are there any Singaporeans? E-government, Singapore always stops, because they are great in the e-government, right? Yeah.

But at the time, when we're going to say Singapore tops e-government, are they tops in openness? We in the Philippines, we have crappy Internet and crappy e-government, but we always top in Civil Society stuff and media freedom, et cetera, et cetera. But were we able to maximize the network society benefits of openness. If we were only -- anyway, that's it.

So there were lack of measurements in many of these. There was no analysis how Civil Society was using it. If e-Governance is really state and citizens with Civil Society in the middle, how can we not measure the capacity of Civil Society to be intermediaries to this? How could we have no legal and policy context to some of this e-readiness, for example, in a country where there is a duopoly, where Internet affordability is very prohibitive. Doesn't that compromise a citizen's right to the Internet, and therefore, the right to access governance? Yeah? So that's what we wanted to do.

Still no presentation? Anyway, it was working a while ago.

So, here we are developing a new concept or notion of e-Governance, open governance, and open e-Governance, where the key difference is governance is broader. E-Governance refers to how ICT is used in that sense. Okay? We wanted to develop measurable indicators and metrics, and we want to do a pilot assessment. So we were fortunate enough to get some support from IDRC, the Canadian International Development Resource Center, which was starting its -- I don't know where you are. I am in the background. Okay. Okay.

So, it was supported by IDRC, which is starting its ICTM governance sort of portfolio. So in 2011, we had -- it was an Asian fund, so we did Philippines, Hong Kong, Thailand, and Pakistan. Very diverse, no? Different economic systems, different economic development. 2012, we came together in Bangkok to learn from phase one and plan for phase two.

Unfortunately, phase two did not materialise because of IDRC political and funding dynamics, so we were in sort of a hiatus, until we were able to secure a bit of support from the project, MAVC. In 2016, they were able to secure the grant to do updating the framework and assessment tool.

You remember, that two-year hiatus, a lot of things were happening. You know, open data was coming into the picture, open contracting. The OGP, which is the most significant state-driven openness initiative globally had come into being. So we wanted to test the instrument, not only in Asia, so we had Pakistan and Philippines as the old testers. We wanted something new. Indonesia, which is also part of the OGP. Then we went to Africa, Uganda, and we went to Colombia. And we wanted to consolidate these learnings and finalise the tool and the toolkit, which for us means can we now go from version .9999 to version 1.0 and release it, so that any country who wants to study their jurisdiction using the tool can do so.

I will rush very quickly now. So, yeah, okay. These are the expected outputs. We did the tool. We have country reports in the five countries and a synthesis paper. And the outcome we wanted was can this be evolved into a multi-country study where more and more countries will see this as an important measure of where we are, and therefore, in that sense, Civil Society can use it as an advocacy tool as well. Oh, you don't have an FIO law. Oh, you have access policies but nothing on gender, or nothing on accessibility. Oh, you have very good e-government, but only 40% of your population is connected, so therefore 60% cannot access online government services. Yeah? Okay.

What is it showing now? Sorry, I cannot see anything. Is it five dimensions of open eGov? Okay. I will rush here, because what the others will do is give a flavor of some of these dimensions using how they assess their own countries. But just to briefly go through it, I have to follow it on my own. There are five dimensions. First is meshed e--government. You don't have to copy or memorize. There's no test after this. But it's basically the back end. How is government organised to be able to provide openness? For example, is there an open data policy? Is there an open standards policy? Is there an enterprise architecture, which links up, or are government agencies still in silos? Yeah?

On the other hand, is there -- are there institutional mechanisms in charge of this? E-participation channels is the dimension. If this was -- the previous one was the back end. This is probably the front end. What is the citizen facing application that allows citizens to engage? So are the government websites updated and interactive? Are there comment sections? Are they accessible to PWDs? Are there women's sections, because -- yeah. Okay.

Third is digital inclusion. Again, the example being how can we participate in governance online if we are not even

connected, raised in the plenary session earlier. So the digital inclusion, which means both access and literacy, is the main element of this dimension. Especially for disadvantaged groups, et cetera, et cetera.

So it's involved with, is government really serious about enabling a wider public's use of ICTs and the Internet for development.

Next, number four, is -- wait. Number four is ICT Enabled Civil Society. Again, what you want it to do -- because e-Governance is not merely e-government. E-government is just a part of e-Governance, because governance involves a collective steering of society by all players, not just the government. And therefore, what we wanted to do is have a qualitative assessment of the intermediary organisations especially. How are ICTs being used by Civil Society? And this, I think one of the speakers will say we have the least data on in many countries.

Next, Open Legal Policy Ecosystems. Again, the point being that we may have this good projects and programmes, but if the overall legal and policy environment is not conducive to openness, yeah, we have good e-government, but there is a ban on public assembly. Or there are restrictions on the freedom of information. Or there are restrictions on freedom of expression. Yeah? There's a public order law. There's a draconian online libel law.

So how can we say these are open if some of these things, and most of the things we put here are not really focused solely on the Internet space. They may be also on the offline spaces, but because they are part of the legal policy ecosystem of countries, they also impact the e-Governance space. And so we have a lot there. And we also have something new. Network neutrality came up as a public policy issue quite late in the day, but it's terribly important, right? Who controls -- who are the gatekeepers of the Internet, right? Who determines what passes through the pipes? Yeah? So it's not traditional censorship in the old sense of the word, but it's filtering of content, it's gatekeeping, according to type of content on the Internet. Doesn't that impact openness?

Okay, it's a PDF, supposed to be a cool animation, but it's a PDF. So basically, we have the five dimensions, and this is how we're looking at it. Meshed e-Government and e-participation, the back end and the front end of e-Government, as you were, and a policy to include everybody, it's like the supply side of openness, and that is e-Government. Yeah? The role of Civil Society is the demand side. It enables the demand side, therefore it is not just e-Government, it's e-Governance already, and e-Government is just a subset of e-Governance, and everything is impacted by the legal and policy ecosystems.

So this is what we were discussing many, many months with the researchers, how do we frame this.

Very quickly on methodology -- well, I'll skip it because we have no more time. In the open forum, yeah?

What you have now is a very quick flier just for this event where the scores -- there is a bit of an error, a typo error, which maybe Lisa can explain, but I just wanted to flash that. There was actually scoring done per country, and there's a lot of different ways to skin this cat, right? We can go by dimension, we can go by country, we can go by, you know, demand side. That's it. Thank you. What I'll do now is pass it on to the national researchers. The national researchers, we asked them to highlight one dimension which they felt was significant in their research, and in the process, you understand the dimensions more through their actual practice.

Okay, thank you. So, first is Banyu from Indonesia.

>> INDRIYATNO BANYUMURTI: Okay. Thank you, Al. I think all of this research, part of the country. Because, yes, what I already mentioned that this research is four dimensions, and also, we need to try to elaborate all of these dimensions. And what I want to share in this moment is what we have already found in Indonesia perspective.

So can we -- oh, okay. Maybe I will give you -- before the slide comes up.

As we already know, Indonesia, big country, we have 17,000 islands, 34 provinces that consists of more than 50 cities or agencies. So when FMAA requests to the ICT Watch, can you do this research, the first question is the scope of the research. We have to assess all of this, all of the local government, which is 500 small cities or small agencies, it would be difficult, it can take maybe a whole year or maybe more. So we found out about this, our national scope, the central government, and also the political organisation.

In Indonesia, now we have around 130 million of users. Around 52% of organisations. But, unfortunately, most of it still localised in the Java islands, more than maybe 70% of the Internet user still centralised in the islands. That's why when we talk about inclusiveness, when we talk about the digital gap, when we talk about digital literacy, we have more challenges, because, yeah, many of the digital fight is still accessed in our country.

And then, related to this research, we offer like -- like I already mentioned that Indonesia is one of the member and also the founder of open government partnerships, and the chair in 2014. And also we have the open government Indonesia, which is coordinated by Presidential office, and then they launched like a data -- part of centralised data for all of the government institutions in Indonesia. But not implemented by all of this government agency, government institution is still lack of understanding and implementation on the applications. And also, we also in progress in (?) that have the interoperability and government data. This maybe will be enacted within this year.

So also, it's coordinated, so we hope this policy will incorporate all of the government institution, especially the local government, to start thinking about the importance of one data and openness, data openness, because, yeah, this is actually still like a new -- new terms for us.

And then research conduct. First, we did a desk study. We collect the secondary data, check the website, and social media for all of the Ministry or central government institutions and also for some of the organisation that we -- that's involved in this research, and then we interview some of the key persons and we make the -- like the draft of this calling with some draft paper of it. After that, we make the validation workshop. With many stakeholders, their government there, Ministry of Communication and IT, and also we have private sector, ISB Association, ISB actor, e-commerce association, and also the academia from some universities, and also, the CSO, the disability communities.

So we confirm what we already found in the study, in the interview with them. We just make, like, some FGD, and then we try to detail one by one, and then we agree to get a core of it. And then after this is finished, we do like the synthesis, also with the FMAO and the other countries to reconfirm the scores.

Okay. The score you can find in this, but what we want to focus one thing is the dimension of the mass e-Government. Some of the dimension that you can see in this brochure, like first the government -- we have already got the -- not the guidance. The policy. But for the detail of the e-Government framework, or e-Government plan, we have -- we still don't have for that kind of this plan or framework.

Also, Indonesia has a lot of public information in act of 2008, and we have I.D. for the integrated intergovernmental portal. What we now want to post is interpersonal protection, because we still don't have the personal data protection law, but we have already a ministerial decree. The Minister said that because the process to be the law is very long, so we have this intermediary, quote unquote, policy regulation tool related to personal data protection issues.

For the e-procurement, we already have the integrated organisation and also the policy, and also, related to cybersecurity, there is a new update also. In May, the President just released like a Presidential decree to establish -- what do you call it -- the national cyber cryptography organisation. This is possible to see information and cybersecurity issues. But unfortunately, this new agency is like so -- like government-minded, because in this introduction, also said that the cybersecurity is the part of the government issue to be strengthened. So we see this in this organisation also, mention about the government. It will be established in September, so we have to wait to see what the implementation.

Okay. That's it. The important thing is, yeah, we really

appreciate this research, and hope we can implement it, not only the national scope, but also the local scope so we can find out what the score of the e-Government for each of the local government. Thank you.

>> ALAN ALEGRE: Thank you, Banyu. Yeah, let's have a round of applause.

[Applause]

We are a bit thrown off because the presentations we are prepared for are not...

So he was supposed to talk about a general overview, and then to focus on the meshed e-Government side, so he was citing a lot of the laws and policies that are present and not present in Indonesia.

So the country report should be available online very soon. We're in the final editorial stage, so please bear with us a bit.

The next will be Lisa from the Philippines, and she'll also focus on one dimension.

>> LISA GARCIA: Yes. Good morning, everyone. So I'll be presenting some of the results of the study in the Philippines. So, first of all, I'll be giving to you a brief country context in terms of openness and e-Governance. It's not showing. I can't see. Sorry.

So anyway, we have a constitution, which is guidance for freedoms, and we have active citizens in the Philippines. We have robust media outlets. There's the rise of alternative media sources and the use of social networking platforms is very much there. However, there are some laws that limit potential freedoms and freedoms of the press, such as the libel, and then we also have the anti-wiretapping law. There's continued killings of journalists, and then there's creeping authoritarianism. Martial law is still in place in the whole of the Mindanao Island.

In terms of growth of ICT use, it's very much there in the urban areas. However, there's lack of meaningful ICT access, especially among marginalised sectors. There's also conflicting signals from government regarding the use of social media, although I understand that they recently came up with a social media policy for government. There are gaps in ICT policy leadership in the past, as well as capacity of some state agencies. There's lack of meaningful Civil Society consultation in ICT policy, and there is development of spectrum policy, which is being questioned.

Yeah, Internet penetration is quite high. It's almost 50% now, because these are old figures, and mobile penetration is 114 as of 2015, but it's now 126%. Fixed broadband prescriptions, as of 2014, is about 23 million. If you look at the figures, this would tell you where that access, for instance, in the Philippines, ICT use and ICT skills are concentrated in some regions.

In terms of what Al was saying, we also compare the Philippines scores with some of the indicators that we looked into, and it would show that the Philippines ICT indices is generally high, especially in terms of skills and human capital development, but low in terms of general state and use of ICT infrastructure.

In terms of the methodology, what we did was to review -- do a secondary review of data. We also undertook a review of cabinet level websites, so we look at the dimensions and where they apply. And then we had two country validation workshops where we had a total of 17 participants, eight of them are male and nine are female. The respondents came from Civil Society, from Government, and from the academia. And then to provide information on Civil Society access to ICTs. We undertook a mini survey to get their perception on the types of -- how they use ICTs.

So this would be the overall score of the Philippines. So it's about six when you total the different scores for each of the dimensions. The country, of course, is highest in terms of ICT empowered Civil Society, but lowest in e-participation channels, and that would be -- and I would be highlighting it. So we looked at the following indicators for ICT empowered Civil Society. This is the use of ICTs for internal organisation use for coordination with allies for public engagement and action, and the use of ICT for online resource building.

So as I mentioned, we did a mini survey, so we looked at the practices of some NGOs, including women's organisations, organisations that deal with children. Some faith-based groups, one political party. And the score is quite high. It's .77, if 1 is the highest.

But in terms of -- for researchers, I mean, it was difficult for us to measure this dimension, because there were few available resources that measure this. However, as I said, we did focus group instructions and also key informant interviews with a group of NGO Civil Society organisations, and there's a level of awareness and use of ICTs, and this may be due to the fact that those whom we surveyed were mostly based in the national capital region.

But in terms of fundraising and online resources, there's very little use of this we found out in the Philippines. Nevertheless, we can say there's relatively abundance of Civil Society groups and political parties that are using already ICTs, and especially mobile phones.

So overall, if we look at the total picture of the Philippines, there's relative better meshed e-Government dimension. Today, when we measured it in 2012, because there's an e-Government plan and interoperability framework that has been adopted. The scores in e-participation and digital inclusion dimensions are quite low, but there are several channels for participation available, but how these should be

used by Civil Society groups is a question.

And then it also shows -- the study also shows that there's lack of supply of ICT services and capacity to meet demand for participation. We don't know if that's due to political leadership or bureaucratic capacity. Nervous, ICT dimension is relatively high, and there is a significant demand in participation among groups. And it is necessary to enhance participation, including enhancing universal access, especially by women and basic sectors.

And to summarize, while there has been growth in e-Governance policies and programmes for channels of participation, the Philippines is still weak in terms of digital inclusion policies, such as literacy policies, policies when it comes to access for marginalised group access for women. This is despite the fact that Civil Society is very much into ICT -- they use ICT components, and it should be harnessed actually to allow for greater participation. There's a need to improve the open legal and policy environment in the country, especially the constraints related to freedom of expression, assembly, and the growing concentration of media.

And just to update you, we plan to publish a synthesis report for all the five countries soon, and then, I think Al mentioned already that the project methodology, the survey instrument that we used will also be published in the website of FMA. And then the findings will also be presented to government agencies in the Philippines so that they would know how they scored and perhaps policies can be amended. Thank you.

>> ALAN ALEGRE: Thank you, Lisa. Round of applause for Lisa and Philippines.

[Applause]

Just want to highlight that the nature for index is comparative, but also within countries, there is a time element, right? When we started the OeGI, it was a previous regime, right? And then now when we're doing it, we are at the start of a new regime, which is constricting space a little bit. So there is some significance to do it on a regular basis. Yeah.

So I think we're ready to take the remote participation of Shazhad Ahmad, director of Bytes for All in Pakistan. Is he coming out? I cannot see. He's participating from Islamabad, I think. Can someone brief me if someone's coming up? Because if not, I'll call Ritu.

>> SHAZHAD AHMAD: Hello. Can you hear me? Hello?

>> ALAN ALEGRE: So just so we won't waste time, I'll call on Ritu now. Ritu is from India. And, again, she was not a part of this initiative, but we value an external eye who are doing similar stuff. In her case, it's a digital exclusion study, which we are also -- they are also developing an index. So insofar as we want to converge efforts, we invited Ritu. Take it away, Ritu.

>> RITU SRIVASTAVA: Thanks, Al. I'll start with -- okay.

So, when we started digital exclusion index, we were thinking whether Internet is an enabler of rights or a disabler of rights. So this we started when we -- two years back when we started talking about India, digital programme has come out, and then out of 15 services, nine services were majorly focusing on digital services and making India digitally enabled.

So the process, what we started talking about, whether really India is progressing towards digitally enabled, or is it going backwards that side, or it's making more excluded society.

I will -- okay. Okay.

So I will go through with the research methodology, what we started with. What are the indicators of the methodology, and how do we conceptualise this methodology into our parameters, and what is the next plan forward for this. So for this study, this is a study we have identified, the four. Fourth is disability, gender, and age. And all of these mediators fall into the same hierarchy as well.

The first parameter is the first line, and second is geography, so it means that the geography is the second barrier. Third is illiteracy. Disability is the fourth barrier. Gender is the fifth barrier. Age is the sixth barrier. So in this report, this report is -- before I start going into the digital exclusion report, let me give you the one -- let me give you the demographic situation of the country, which will be verified in the -- as we go about. So in India, 70% of the population is living in rural part of the countries. As of now, there are 420 million Internet connections in India. Despite this fact that rural India is only 16% connected, according to the IMI report. While urban India is about 50%. But let's verify if this is true or not through this study as well.

So this exclusion chapter was a part of a large index report, India exclusion report, which is also -- and the report is identifying whether digital and ICT services are public goods or not. So this is a study to understand this parameter as well.

As I have said, there are six parameters, which we have taken out, poverty, geography, illiteracy, disability, gender, and age. We identified that digital exclusion as a denial and inequality with regard to personal access to ICTs, the skill to use devices, of ones without having any assistance, the ability to leverage the benefits of ICTs. This also identifies that poverty is one of the major barriers to Internet access. When I say why, so it's like currently that India data plan is about hundred rupees, which is about two dollars, which is still on the higher side for India, because it should not be more than rupees 34, which is less than one dollar, about 76 cents or something. Because to make Internet affordable in India, it has to come below -- come to about 34 rupees. Poverty and socioeconomic -- the lower rungs of the economic ladder. And if we think what are the other directions of the -- to access

Internet is the access to electricity.

So only 55% of the rural households have electricity. We also identified some of the tangible and non-tangible opportunities, which are provided by the ICT devices. So tangible opportunities were communication, participation, and association. In educational, we found that access to information ideas, knowledge, and skilled development is another aspect. Resources and source of economic and social capital formation is another aspect to -- another aspect of ICT devices. While non-tangible opportunities was freedom of anonymity.

During the chapter of exclusion, which we also -- I have gone through, why we are excluded. There are two parameters which we identified, that ineffective agencies and exclusion. When we talk about the ineffective agencies, in India, there are -- the core policies which drive through the exclusion or drive the inclusion, they are not effective to implement the policies. For example, the national fiberoptic line, which is supposed to be laid out by 2016 is still not half done.

And then, other ineffective range of things were like -- were discrimination of access to digital services. Also legitimate expression online, shutting down the network, sometimes especially when in a stage of demontisation happened in India, so a group of exclusion for this purpose. This chapter, which we have conducted, is now transforming into the exclusion index. We are taking the same parameters for this report and to identify whether India is digitally enabled or not, and how it is going to be -- how excluded we are.

In some of the cases, I'll also try to give some examples. So, for example, if we want to afford the Internet, there's -- a person needs to travel 20 -- a person needs to travel sometimes five kilometers and give about rupees 20 for Internet costs. So the cost of travel and the cost of daily spending is also to be considered when we are measuring the exclusion as well.

So these are some of the findings of the research and the report, and some of the parameters as well, says that gender is one of the major barriers for -- is a major barrier that women are discriminated by the society to access the digital devices.

>> ALAN ALEGRE: Thank you very much, Ritu. Round of applause for Ritu.

[Applause]

So you see how effective we are in spending one hour to talk about thousands of hours of work. Sorry. But they'll be online, but get our names, get the links. The presentations will be online. We probably won't have time for Shazhad because there's another that will use this room very shortly. But if it takes a few questions that are very urgent, some insights, keep it short, please. We'll take it. But we want to be interactive. Please just go to the mic and introduce yourself. Yeah, please. The mic is not working too much. Can we have some volume for the mic?

>> Okay. The mic is working now. Thank you so much for the interesting panel. I am representing UNESCO. I want to congratulate you for developing such a wonderful index and open governance, which is so comprehensive. I must say, I was always focused on the e-Government. And also, I believe it is not only useful for the Asia Pacific region, it can also be used for the rest part of the world. And for us, it's also useful because we're also developing a range of indicators to measure the Internet universality. We are focusing on four dimensions which are overlapping with yours. The first is about human rights. And the second one is on openness. We are also advocating for open Internet. And open government initiative. A dimension we are developing is on the accessibility. Again, a fundamental to the e-Governance. And fourth, talking about the governance model. I see so much embodying your index. I look forward to working more with you. Also, UNESCO is organisationing a session on Saturday at lunchtime, you can also come, we can have a discussion. Thank you.

[Applause]

>> ALAN ALEGRE: Thank you all. So our whole orientation is to study everything that's coming out, because a lot of things are coming out, and to see what we can learn and integrate. So it's not a fixed index from our point of view. We will evolve it, and we will release it on a per version basis. So we are going to release a version one.

Secondly, I think those that will not be here, Uganda and Colombia, are also very high that they want to do it in their region. So I will make a page that if there are any -- if you know of any resources that want to do it either regionally or nationally, we can sort of coordinate and help each other. Our only role is really just to help the research teams in countries sort of aligned with the general methodology so there is compatibility across the data.

Any other questions? Yeah, please.

>> I am Gilbert. Advocates from freedom of expression coalition, southeast Asia. I know that you are doing baseline research work on this index, but my question is will you also have some normative recommendations in your report? Thank you.

>> ALAN ALEGRE: A bit of clarification. We are -- we are not doing private research, but, yes, we are baselining. We have only done secondary research, but finding out that for some dimensions, we need to do primary. For example, Civil Society use. Nobody is really doing it. We might reach out to do something with them on this.

Normative, that's a tricky question. Is this a descriptive index or a prescriptive index? I think we are very clear that there is an advocacy component, and openness that we are proposing is a norm. It's a normative term, in terms of we value openness rather than close, yeah? And, yeah, we'd like to work with you because in southeast Asia, everybody is

backsliding on openness and democracy. So... but don't quote me on that.

Do you want to add, Banyu? Okay. Yes, sir.

[away from mic]

>> ALAN ALEGRE: Thank you. Quick reaction about the tool. OeGI 1 had an open spectrum policy question, but after the first round. I think many countries were still not ready to engage that issue, and we felt that even on a knowledge basis, there might have been a domain knowledge issue. So we just reduced it first to a couple of areas, which is universal access policy, and in the legal and regulatory environments. So, yeah. As we go along with the telecomms' development, and spectrum is becoming a key for access, we might start putting it back as a separate question. Yes, thank you.

The one saying zero minutes. What are you saying? We have to leave the room? Yes, I suppose so. You guys want to have any last words?

>> If you're interested in the concept of what OeGI e-Governance is, it's the methodology that we use, the manual that we use to survey instrument, and it's already available online. You can just go to the website of FMA, www.fma.ph.

>> ALAN ALEGRE: As a final word, I will say that although we will release it, we're welcome to any feedback. And what we want to do is to test it first, more countries. So right now, in a space of about five to eight countries who have done something. So if your country is interested, we can do it. But, again, there are resource considerations, so a special call out to resource organisations, donor agencies, because we can run with it. Indonesia plans to do it on a sub national level, because they cannot just look at what's happening in Java, right? But in the other islands. So we can do it a lot more.

So with that, we thank you. We thank you for your time and your interest, and we hope to still get your feedback. We are trying to get a session in the IGF in Geneva, but it's our Colombian partner who has applied, and I am not sure if that was accepted. But if you're in IGF and the Latin American partner succeeds, you will hear about that, but if not, you can contact us. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

We have to leave, I think. There's another session.

>> If there are questions, you can come back to this room at 5:00 p.m. today for further questions.

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

