

**IGF 2016 Workshop Report**  
**WS84 - Youth in IG: Capacity Building vs Policy Discussion**

**Date:** 7 Dec 2016

**Time:** 12:00 - 13:30

**Workshop Organisers:**

Hans Martens, Insafe network coordinator, European Schoolnet / Insafe  
David NG, Director of Community Development, DotAsia Organisation

**Chairperson/Moderators:**

David NG, Director of Community Development, DotAsia Organisation  
Bianca HO, Director of International Relations, DotKids Foundation

**Rapporteur/Note Taker:**

Yannis Li, Secretariat of APriIGF

**List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations:**

Adela Goberna, Youth Observatory  
Martin Fischer, Network of European digital youth  
Joachim Kind, German Safer Internet Centre  
Jianne Soriano, NetMission.Asia  
Haoran Huang, Asia Pacific Internet Governance Academy  
Olga Cavalli, ICANN Governmental Advisory Committee, South School on Internet Governance  
Rodrigo De La Parra, ICANN

**Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):**

- The best practice of youth engagement in Internet governance and involve youth in policy discussion
- Ways to enhance cooperation among different youth initiatives

**If there are Presentations during the workshop session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each Presentation**

**Adela Goberna, Youth Observatory, LAC**, emphasized that youth should be as part of stakeholders of the discussion, with collaboration with all stakeholders, and be included at all levels of the processes.

**Martin Fischer, Network of European digital youth**, stated there are six principles of the youth work outreach including 1) Co-management, 2) Multistakeholderism, 3) Youth involvement in agenda setting for IG events, 4) Cost-free participation of the youth, 5) Continuous engagement of and by the youth and 6) Informed representation.

**Joachim Kind, German Safer Internet Centre**, talked about the work of capacity building among children and youth in Germany, and agree that it is crucial to giving youth a platform to share views and participate in shaping policy, more importantly is bringing youth to the policy marking level for real impacts.

**Jianne Soriano, NetMission.Asia**, mentioned the youth initiatives such as YouthIGF, HKYIGF and NetY programs in the asia pacific region. And realized that youth is not directly engaged in the policy discussion, however creating a platform for youth to speak and organise events is a good direction to get things started.

**Haoran Huang, Asia Pacific Internet Governance Academy**, shared his experience as youth fellow to ICANN and IGF, and expressed gratitude to organisations that facilitated youth to attend the meetings, which is a sufficient starting point to encourage young people participating in Internet Governance.

**Olga Cavalli, ICANN - Governmental Advisory Committee and the South School on Internet Governance**, noted that there is a gap to be filled regarding youth and women participation in Internet Governance, and stated that it is important to not isolated youth but mixed and exchanged the view with other stakeholders to engage in the policy work.

**Rodrigo De La Parra, ICANN**, showed support to youth participation in Internet Governance and added there are fellowship and regional programmes, such as NextGen@ICANN, Fellowship and Asia Pacific Internet Governance Academy that youth can get involved in the ICANN discussion.

**Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session:  
(3 paragraphs)**

The first discussion focus was how to empower young people to make actual impact in policy-making and legislative discussions as well as taking their views into account. For instance, encouraging youth to join some existing channels such as non-commercial users constituency (NCUC) of ICANN or including more youth-panelists on relevant issues to consult their perspective. However, more collaboration and effort among different stakeholders are needed to push the youth involvement into a greater height, for example, lobbying local government to form consultation youth-committee or consider the discussion outcomes from youth IGFs.

It is acknowledged that youth is not a homogenous group but also with very diverse backgrounds and interest. We shall endeavour to not neglect any minority voices. Therefore, it is important that youth is not isolated as a stakeholder group but rather be part of the other stakeholders. Support and collaboration shall also be given among multi-stakeholders while youth are still at the stage of deciding their career hence influencing the future stakeholder groups that they will be affiliated with.

Last but not least, awareness raising and inclusiveness of IGF were discussed. It is suggested to include Internet Governance topics in the curriculum for education, encourage workshop organizers giving floor to youth, organize mentorship to facilitate youth participation in IGF as well as create web platform to exchange information of youth related initiatives.

**Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways: (3 paragraphs)**

The session reaches a consensus that we should not look at youth separately, but part of the existing stakeholders, and it is important to put youth involvement in the level which brings impact to policy dialogues and legislative process.

There are collaborations raised by participants, such as Internet Governance research network that engage the youth community, online platform for Internet governance knowledge sharing, as well as YIGF toolkit which enables and encourages the community to organize local initiatives.

For facilitating youth participation in Internet Governance Forum, it is suggested to introduce or self-organize mentorship program, which mentors need not to be IGF veterans or senior roles, but people who attended IGFs before to just provide a brief understanding of the meeting for newbies.