

# Freedom Online Coalition

## Strategy & Coordination Meeting, February 2025

---

Summary Report | Taipei, Taiwan



# FOC Strategy and Coordination Meeting - Report

## 24-25 February | Taipei, Taiwan

The first FOC Strategy and Coordination Meeting (SCM) in 2025 took place on 24-25 February in Taipei, Taiwan. The SCM included in-person and virtual participation from 13 FOC Members, 1 Observer, and 25 FOC Advisory Network Members.

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Session Summaries</b>	<b>2</b>
Day 1, Monday, 24 February	2
Day 2, Tuesday, 25 February	4
Side-Event, 26 February	5
<b>Annex 1: SCM Agenda (abridged)</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Annex 2: Minutes</b>	<b>7</b>



## Session Summaries<sup>1</sup>

---

### Day 1, Monday, 24 February

#### Welcome Remarks & Overview of Program of Action Implementation

9:00 - 9:45 UTC+8

*Participants:* FOC Members and Observers, FOC Advisory Network; Support Unit

*Format:* Hybrid

The SCM opened with welcome remarks from Rasmus Lumi, Director-General for the Department of International Organisations and Human Rights, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Estonia, who thanked the 2024 Chair of the FOC, the Netherlands, and highlighted the importance of continuing to strengthen engagement with the multistakeholder community, which is paramount for governments to take the right decisions for international diplomacy and negotiations relating to Internet governance. Mr. Lumi noted that as Chair, Estonia is exploring methods to support CSOs and their engagement in processes relating to the FOC's mandate, and provided an overview of the FOC's priorities in 2025: governance and use of digital technologies and the Internet, digital inclusion and digital public infrastructure, and cross-regional engagement. Mr. Lumi also highlighted the topic of undersea cables and the importance of bringing this topic to the attention of the global community as a direct threat to Internet freedom, in addition to facilitating information sharing within the Coalition.

The co-Chairs of the FOC Advisory Network (FOC-AN), Elonnai Hickok, Veronica Ferrari, and 'Gbenga Sesan, provided remarks thanking Estonia as Chair for their leadership and activities that have already taken place this year. The co-Chairs highlighted changes within the broader geopolitical landscape and within the digital rights sector, such as a move away from human rights commitments and language, changes in content regulation and moderation, overly broad cyber regulation, threats to the multistakeholder model of Internet governance, and shrinking civic spaces globally. The co-Chairs underscored the importance for the FOC to be grounded in human rights and to promote human rights solutions and language, and to support the multistakeholder model, including by facilitating trusted spaces for dialogue. In addition, recent FOC-AN activities such as the proactive advice on the WSIS+20 review and guidance for the Universal Periodic Review process were highlighted. In closing, the co-Chairs highlighted growing threats to the work of the FOC, underscoring the critical need over the coming months to facilitate difficult discussions and to self-reflect, especially in light of the increasing boldness of bad actors.

The FOC Support Unit (SU) provided a presentation on the implementation of the 2025 Program of Action (PoA), noting a number of activities and outputs that have already taken place or are upcoming in Q1 and Q2 of the year. The presentation also highlighted activities led by the SU, including the development of the FOC capacity building curriculum and online learning platform, and the language mapping tool, which will be made available in March.

#### Capacity Building: The World Summit on the Information Society Review +20

10:00 - 12:30 UTC+8

*Participants:* FOC Members and Observers, FOC Advisory Network; Support Unit

*Format:* Hybrid

The FOC organized a capacity building session with FOC Members and FOC-AN representatives aimed at simulating the WSIS+20 negotiations. The tabletop exercise, led by Joyce Hakmeh from Chatham House, divided the stakeholders into various geopolitical groupings and replicated the nuances of multilateral digital governance processes. It captured the complexities of arriving at a potential WSIS+20 Review Outcome Document with robust discussion on issues of digital sovereignty, multistakeholderism and upholding of human rights. Participants discussed how digital development could be more equitable, as well as the importance of bridging the digital divide.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to [Annex 2](#) for the minutes of the SC.



The scenario helped stakeholders, including governments, civil society, the technical community, and private sector, understand opposing views by representing positions often different from their native stakeholder grouping. Over 2 and a half hours, the participants were dynamically advocating for competing priorities and making strategic compromises, reflected in the excerpt of the fictional Outcome Document. The interactive nature of the exercise helped the group refine their negotiation strategies, test counter-narratives and build on cooperation within the Coalition through cross-stakeholder exchanges.

## FOC Member Meeting

13:15 - 15.30 UTC+8

*Participants:* FOC Members and Observers; Support Unit

*Format:* Hybrid

The FOC Member meeting commenced with finance updates from the FOC Support Unit (SU), and a discussion on the potential FOC stipend mechanism for human rights defenders. The SU emphasised the importance of multi-year funding in order to ensure the Coalition's sustainability, and noted the possibility of exploring different funding models in the future, if needed. The SU also raised the potential for the FOC to explore establishing a stipend mechanism for human rights defenders, especially for those in the Global South, to engage in key processes related to the FOC's mandate, such as the WSIS+20 review. FOC Member States provided initial feedback on this concept, and requested a written proposal to further these discussions.

The Netherlands, 2024 Chair and current lead for FOC engagement in the WSIS+20 process, presented four thematic areas where the FOC could coordinate in the process, including: Internet governance; information integrity; rights-respecting governance of AI and other digital technologies; and bridging the digital divides. The Netherlands also underscored the importance of strengthening the links between capital, Geneva, and New York representatives, and highlighted upcoming government and multistakeholder meetings to further coordinate and shape the above thematic areas. FOC Members noted broad agreement for the thematic areas, emphasized the need to explore methods to bridge the gap between diplomats in Geneva and New York, and discussed the possibility of Members exploring opportunities to include CSO representatives in their delegations, among other topics.

Estonia, 2025 Chair and lead drafter, presented the zero draft of the Rights-Respecting DPI Principles, noting the intent to facilitate opportunities for the broader multistakeholder community to provide input, through both regional events and a public consultation. FOC Members noted support for the initiative, and provided suggestions for the draft text, including exploring how DPI should function during times of crisis (eg. cyber threats and natural disasters), the need to form a compelling narrative to pitch rights-respecting DPI in light of traction around competing models, and elaborating on the role of the private sector, in addition to exploring linkages with the Universal DPI Safeguards Framework and the FOC Donor Principles for Human Rights in the Digital Age, and including further reference to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights and the FOC.

## FOC Advisory Network Meeting

13:30 - 15.30 UTC+8

*Participants:* FOC Advisory Network (FOC-AN); Support Unit

*Format:* Hybrid

FOC-AN Members discussed a number of topics during their parallel meeting, including support for FOC capacity building, outreach to FOC and non-FOC governments alike, providing proactive and reactive advice to the Coalition, including on the impact of current funding developments, and preparation for the Multistakeholder Dialogue, taking place on the margins of the RightsCon Summit too.



On capacity building for the FOC, FOC-AN Members noted readiness to support, highlighting the need for clear guidance on the specific issues in the programme, the information and timeline required, and the level/affiliations of the government representatives taking part. FOC-AN Members noted this as an opportunity to prepare the Coalition for upcoming negotiations, events, and fora.

On outreach, FOC-AN Members discussed the value of engaging with non-FOC Members and disengaged Coalition governments, noting also the importance of ensuring that current FOC Members exemplify the Membership commitments.

On advice, FOC-AN Members' discussion focused on a request for reactive advice from Estonia on the current funding developments's impact on the existing online ecosystem. FOC-AN highlighted the need to think strategically about the content of the advice and to receive clear instructions on the information required. FOC-AN Members also underlined the current developments as an opportunity for the Coalition to step up in its support to non-governmental stakeholders. In addition, FOC-AN suggested that should the Steering Committee have concerns regarding the publication of any FOC-AN piece of advice, to have those shared with the FOC-AN, if possible.

During the preparation for the Multistakeholder Dialogue, FOC-AN Members discussed previously held FOC regional dialogues and the need for continuity, follow up and clear objectives regarding holding these meetings. In addition, FOC-AN Members briefly provided an overview of the FOC Rapid Response Mechanism, as well as the need to clarify the process surrounding FOC-AN's support for FOC governments' engagement in the Universal Periodic Review process. They also agreed to continue discussions on the idea for FOC-AN Members to hold an event at the upcoming IGF 2025 in Oslo, Norway.

## Day 2, Tuesday, 25 February

### FOC Multistakeholder Dialogue

08:30 - 10.00 UTC+8

*Participants:* FOC Members and Observers; FOC Advisory Network; Support Unit

*Format:* Hybrid

The multistakeholder dialogue was hosted by Estonia, FOC Chair 2025, on the margins of RightsCon in Taipei, Taiwan, and included FOC Member States, FOC Advisory Network (FOC-AN) representatives, and external stakeholders from the region. Rasmus Lumi, Director General for International Organisations and Human Rights in Estonia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, provided opening remarks and an outline of FOC priorities for 2025, including tech governance in the context of the WSIS+20 Review and GDC implementation; developing digital public infrastructure (DPI) in a human-centric and rights-respecting manner; and continuing cross-regional FOC engagement and outreach with partners in the global Majority.

The discussion commenced with a reflection by regional stakeholders on the trends, priorities, and developments in the Asia-Pacific region since the FOC regional dialogue held in August 2024 in Taipei, on the sidelines of the Asia-Pacific IGF. Participants discussed the importance of protecting critical infrastructure, such as undersea cables, given recent incidents in North Taiwan and the Baltic Sea, and the impact this has on connectivity and access to information, particularly for countries which rely on undersea cables for access to the Internet. Other trends included continuous Internet shutdowns by authoritarian governments under the guise of cybersecurity legislation and growing regional discussions on expanding DPI systems. Regarding DPI, participants noted that there is limited attention in these discussions on developing more robust accountability mechanisms, particularly when it comes to addressing cybersecurity and cybercrime issues, as well as ensuring a rights-respecting approach to the supply-side and building of such infrastructure, noting conflict and human rights abuses which can



occur such as in the DRC. Participants encouraged FOC governments to ensure their positions are informed by human rights-respecting approaches to DPI and critical infrastructure.

Regarding recent regional developments, participants highlighted an exacerbation of shrinking civic space in the region, in the context of funding freezes globally. It was noted that the region has had a rigid regulatory environment which has previously stifled civil society's work, and that this has been further exacerbated with the cuts to funding. As a result, it has become increasingly difficult for civil society organisations and others in the region to meaningfully participate in international Internet governance discussions and consultations, such as the Global Digital Compact (GDC) and UNESCO initiatives. Participants also highlighted that there has been a tendency for over-regulation in the region, making it difficult to effectively implement and causing a trade-off between human rights considerations and regulation, contributing to further shrinking civic space and the stifling of freedom of expression - particularly on issues of cybersecurity and disinformation across the region.

Participants noted disinformation campaigns in the region often originate from private actors, sometimes funded by candidates and political parties themselves, leading to limited action taken to disrupt or take-down such campaigns. Simultaneously, participants highlighted an accelerating trend towards transnational repression as a result of the actions of authoritarian regimes within Asia-Pacific. When discussing methods to counter such trends, participants shared examples of cross-regional collaboration, such as between civil society in Ukraine and Taiwan sharing intel and lessons learned.

In closing remarks, Estonia thanked participants for their time and input, noting that FOC governments are discussing ways to further support the work of civil society, and are keen to continue discussions on the issues emerging from the dialogue.

## Side-Event, 26 February

### Operationalising the Donor Principles: a Focus on Digital Resilience Support and Human Rights Impact Assessments

17:30 - 19:00 UTC+8

*Participants:* FOC Members and Observers; FOC Advisory Network; External Stakeholders; Support Unit

*Format:* In-Person

The FOC, the International Development Research Centre, and Global Partners Digital co-hosted the side-event "Operationalising the Donor Principles: A Focus on Digital Resilience Support and Human Rights Impact Assessments" in the evening of Wednesday, 26 February on the margins of RightsCon. This session brought together FOC stakeholders and external actors to discuss the implementation of the Donor Principles for Human Rights in the Digital Age, which were developed under the FOC's auspices in 2023. It specifically focused on two principles - human rights impact assessments (Principle 4) and digital security efforts (Principle 8).

The discussion highlighted the pressing need for donors to embed safeguards and accountability mechanisms into digital programming to mitigate risks to human rights. The session also underscored the necessity of deeper donor collaboration to enhance coordination, align strategies, and share best practices in rights-based digital programming. Participants highlighted the need to balance high-level guidance with practical methodologies, and to ensure adaptability, acknowledging the differentiation between tech-driven versus traditional development projects. The importance of stronger stakeholder engagement across different donor and program types was highlighted during the session, and participants suggested that funding and reporting structures should incentivise substantive HRIA processes. Ongoing efforts, such as the collaboration between IDRC and GPD to develop a digital HRIA toolbox, were examined as practical steps toward strengthening donor capacity in this



space. Finally, process-based frameworks were favored over rigid metrics to ensure more meaningful human rights impact assessments.

## Annex 1: SCM Agenda (abridged)

### Day 1: Monday, 24 February

Time (UTC+8)	Topic	Attendees
08.45	Arrival at the TICC / RightsCon Registration	FOC; Observer; FOC Advisory Network
09.00	Opening Remarks & Overview of Upcoming Activities	FOC; Observer; FOC Advisory Network
09.45	Coffee Break (15 minutes)	
10.00	Capacity Building Simulation: The World Summit on the Information Society Review +20	FOC; Observer; FOC Advisory Network
12.30	Lunch Break (45 minutes)	
13.15	FOC Budget & Fundraising Updates ( <i>Govt-Only</i> )	FOC; Observer
13.30	FOC Positions & Engagement in the WSIS+20 Process ( <i>Govt-Only</i> )	FOC; Observer
14.30	Rights-Respecting Principles for Digital Public Infrastructure ( <i>Govt-Only</i> )	FOC; Observer
15.30	Recap & Reflections	
15.45	Taipei 101 Tour, organised by Taiwan (15.45 - 16.15)	
16.30	RightsCon Opening Ceremony ( <i>Plenary Hall, TICC</i> )	
19.00	FOC Community Dinner Hosted by Estonia	

### Day 2: Tuesday, 25 February

8.30	FOC Multistakeholder Dialogue	
10.00	End of Session	

### Side-Event: Wednesday, 26 February

17.30	Operationalising the Donor Principles: a Focus on Digital Resilience Support and Human Rights Impact Assessments	
19.30	End of Session	



## Annex 2: Minutes

---

### FOC Members Meeting

Monday, 24 February | 13:15 - 15:30 UTC +8

#### FOC Finance Updates

- The SU provided an update on the FOC's budget and fundraising efforts.
- The SU noted that  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the budget is allocated to CSO and Global South Member travel to FOC events, and introduced the potential stipend mechanism for human rights defenders.
  - The SU posed the question of what the FOC could consider doing in the current funding environment, in which many CSOs, especially in the Global Majority, are losing their funding which is leading to the exclusion of Global Majority CSOs from key discussions and processes related to the FOC's mandate.
  - The SU asked Members whether there could be scope within the current budget to increase it to create more flexibility and have additional funding to contribute to CSO participation in global processes that the FOC is prioritizing (eg. the WSIS+20 process).
    - For WSIS, this additional funding could be used to bring eg. 10 CSO representatives from the Global South to key WSIS milestone events such as the Geneva High-Level Forum and the Global IGF in Norway.
  - In practice, this would mean that the SU seeks to integrate any additional contributions that are committed by FOC Members into the Coalition's budget.
  - The SU noted that annually we administer around 60 travel stipends a year, and that the infrastructure to do this work already exists and would not require anything new to be established.
  - Estonia noted support for this initiative to find additional funding for the CSO community, and encouraged other Members to also look into this possibility.
  - Sweden noted interest in a written document being provided to further detail how pooling of funds or prioritisation can occur, and linking with information on the needs of organisations in the sector.
    - The SU noted that the need for travel support has come from the broader CSO community and recent discussions.
  - Denmark noted the need for a package that details what the landscape is looking like, the importance and value of CSO engagement, and the need for this additional funding support, to help guide colleagues that will be making funding decisions.
    - Denmark provided the example of the Freedom House reports which are a vital resource.
  - The Netherlands noted support for the proposal, and echoed the call for an assessment of the impact and CSO needs.
  - The SU highlighted that securing funding may take time, especially when in the form of new funding requests, and is seeking to form a pitch that aligns with the infrastructure and activities that already exist within the FOC.
  - Finland inquired about whether an increased number of funders creates more of an administrative burden, how much time does fundraising take for the full FOC budget, and whether there are options to streamline this.
    - The SU noted that one part-time staff member's work is largely dedicated to both fundraising and reporting throughout the year.
  - Estonia noted the need to ensure the Coalition remains accessible to new Members, and suggested that compulsory contributions are only explored if the FOC faces a significant funding challenge.
    - Switzerland noted that fees may disincentivize some governments to join, and that such a model shouldn't create too much of an administrative burden.





- The SU noted the option of tiered membership, and highlighted the example of the Global Network Initiative, which has membership fees that differ between individual members.

**Action >>** Support Unit to develop a written proposal for the travel stipend mechanism, and include further details on the current funding landscape for CSOs, especially those in the Global Majority.

### FOC Positions & Engagement in the WSIS+20 Process

- The SU introduced the discussion items, noting the FOC’s engagement in the WSIS process is being led by the Netherlands in liaison with the FOC Chair, Estonia.
  - The SU noted the FOC’s working methods:
    - Information sharing & capacity building
    - Diplomatic coordination
    - Joint advocacy
  - Q1 has been focused on the first working method, which has included a number of online calls and the simulation exercise as part of the SCM.
  - The FOC is now shifting towards diplomatic coordination, through the identification of key themes relating to the Coalition’s mandate, priorities, and positions.
- The Netherlands noted the approach to the WSIS+20 review will be similar to the Coalition’s engagement in the GDC process in 2024, and introduced four thematic areas the FOC could coordinate on in the WSIS:
  - Internet governance (including inclusivity and diversity of stakeholder participation)
  - Information integrity (including freedom of opinion and expression)
  - Rights-respecting governance of AI and other digital technologies
  - Bridging the digital divides (with a focus on access to multilingual and local content, human rights principles for capacity building, and on DPI)
- The Netherlands underscored the importance of strengthening the linkage between capital, Geneva, and New York representatives, and deciding methods for engagement with relevant UN agencies.
- The Netherlands highlighted the upcoming workshop on WSIS to be held in Geneva on 11 March, for which a document is being prepared with proposals for FOC engagement, and emphasised the need for other Members to take a leading role on specific themes as identified above.
- Members reacted to the Netherlands’ proposed themes and activities:
  - The US reflected on the GDC negotiations and coordination efforts, and noted these efforts attempted to tackle several different issues in the context of an increasing FOC Membership but decreasing engagement, and suggested it is worth exploring exactly to what extent the Coalition’s Membership will be able to agree on language.
  - Finland noted the FOC-AN advice which resonated with Finland’s approach to WSIS, and suggested outlining the aspects of the WSIS process that we need to protect as a baseline which would constitute redlines. Finland also suggested developing strategies for any new priorities or text FOC Members may want to introduce. It was also noted that there is strong language on media freedom in the WSIS document, and that FOC Members may want to resurrect this language in relation to information integrity.
  - The UK recognised that Members are looking to safeguard the status quo, and noted the opportunity where Members can upskill and identify a few priority areas where further understanding can be developed on rights-respecting language, such as Internet governance, where there isn’t a need to reinvent the wheel. The UK also noted that areas such as AI and data governance, where Members may need to be more nimble tactical engagement with each other as positions become clear.
    - Finland noted the challenges of making it appealing to maintain the status quo, that this is an opportunity to refresh the existing institutions, and make the argument as to why the current approach is also important in the future.



- Germany highlighted differences in perspectives among New York and Geneva communities, and noted the need to do more to bridge this gap between the diplomatic networks, including through training, further dialogues, and developing a shared understanding of the process.
- Czechia noted the importance to promote human-centric, human rights-based multistakeholder approach, and to emphasize synergies emerging from the GDC, such as the scientific panel on AI, to strengthen the role of the IGF, to review action lines and potentially add more to incorporate commitments from the GDC, and counteract the malign of harmful efforts of some actors.
- Estonia emphasised the possibility of Members exploring including CSO representatives into their delegations for the WSIS process.
  - The US suggested it may be helpful to have a discussion on how public delegates have been included in past processes, including learnings from this process, and how FOC Members can consider this further.
  - The US noted that the document that will be negotiated in April in Geneva at CSTD will move to ECOSOC in New York in July, so discussions on including public delegates are urgent, in addition to scheduling meetings as soon as possible to continue connecting diplomatic networks.
  - Estonia noted that Konstatinos Komaitis joined their delegation last year in the CSTD, which was proposed by Estonia's Geneva representative and approved by the capital, and flagged that this process may differ between countries. Estonia suggested the FOC could collect information on CSOs who do want to join delegations and for FOC Members to match-make where possible.
  - The UK welcomed exploring how FOC Members can ensure CSO inclusion.
  - The UK recognised Estonia's organisation of a high-level call in January, and suggested sharing these success stories on including CSOs in delegations with senior representatives of the Coalition.
    - Estonia supported exploring scheduling a call on a senior-level around the time the process moves from Geneva to New York.
- Finland raised the question on whether the period of review should be argued for 5 years rather than 10, to align with the global development agenda in 2030.
- Denmark noted alignment with the priority themes, and reflected on the simulation exercise including arguments that will need to be formed in support for the multistakeholder approach, looking back at agreed language in WSIS.
- On engaging the WSIS co-facs, Estonia noted efforts to engage Lithuania and Kenya are ongoing.
  - Germany noted caution, and to not try for a formal process, so that their position does not become more difficult through association to just one group of Members.
  - US suggested Sweden as one of the past GDC co-facs to provide further information on how to pursue engagement with the process co-facs in a way that does not cause challenges with their role.
  - The Netherlands clarified that they are not pursuing any formal engagement, but to facilitate information sharing. The Netherlands also noted that Spain and Costa Rica are both FOC Members and are co-facs to establish an International Scientific Panel on Artificial Intelligence and the Global Dialogue on AI Governance, which could be a future engagement opportunity.
  - The UK suggested inviting the co-facs to clarify what would be helpful from Member States for them to fulfill their role, including technical areas of support. The UK noted co-facs have previously had some leeway to shape modalities for stakeholder input, and that if there is no language in the modalities resolution that sets out how stakeholders engage, there is a question on whether Members can look to the co-facs to take on the mantle and be able to shape modalities.



- Switzerland noted the FOC’s Joint Statement on the future of the Multistakeholder Approach at the UN is a consensus document, and whether the co-facs will adhere to the commitments within this output.
- The Netherlands summarised the discussion, noting agreement with the priority themes, and the need to now place more focus on how to form the argument to safeguard the status quo and do so compellingly, and the importance of further strengthening the links between Geneva and New York networks. On stakeholder modalities, the Netherlands noted a discussion has taken place within the FOC, for which the Netherlands will provide further follow up in addition to supporting efforts to explore modalities to engage stakeholders.
- On next steps, the Netherlands highlighted the effort to prepare a summary document on positions and proposals on how the FOC can engage on the priority themes, which will be presented at the March 11 workshop in Geneva.
- The US noted the need to make these discussions approachable for those that are not in the weeds of the process, and to ensure a level playing field for those being brought into the discussions.

### **Rights-Respecting Principles for Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI)**

- Estonia introduced the discussion item, recalling the Goal 2 of the 2025 Program of Action and noting the Rights-Respecting DPI Principles will be a key output of the Chairship.
  - Estonia noted that the broader stakeholder community will have an opportunity to contribute to the principles, and the intent to finalise the document in the second half of the year, potentially around the Tallinn Digital Summit in October.
  - Estonia provided an overview of the current context, highlighting competing models of DPI which have recently gained traction, some of which are not as rights-respecting as the Coalition would want them to be.
  - Estonia highlighted the goal is for like-minded Members of the FOC to agree on what they see as rights-respecting DPI and to socialise this idea, and that the principles will not become too technical and focus on the broader question of what rights-respecting DPI will look like.
- Members provided initial reactions and comments to the draft text:
  - Switzerland suggested exploring how inclusivity can be included and efforts to reduce the digital divide, the digital data-logging aspect of DPI systems, and how DPI should function during crisis or how to maintain service during disruption, such as those caused by cyber threats or natural disaster.
  - Denmark noted support for including diverse input from a range of stakeholders, especially in the Global South, emphasised the current challenges around the roll-back of language relating to DEI by US corporations, and highlighted the need to form a more compelling narrative to convince stakeholders of the importance of grounding the discussion around DPI in human rights.
  - Sweden noted that the topic of DPI includes several government departments, and will require interagency input and review during the drafting process.
  - The Netherlands echoed the call to form a compelling narrative to pitch rights-respecting DPI, and to communicate this as a positive offer, queried what the role of private companies is in DPI and to what extent it could be included in the draft text, and highlighted the importance of trust within the development and use of DPI systems, which could help make the link between human rights and development.
  - Finland highlighted the role of DPI in promoting freedom and rights-respecting public services, and noted that the draft texts include some technical elements such as interoperability and tech neutrality, which may bear no relation to a human rights-based approach by themselves, and suggested investigating how these technical aspects could provide avenues for holding governments accountable and for stakeholders to understand how these create more room for engagement.



- Finland also raised the question of how these principles could be useful for the UN initiatives such as the Universal DPI Safeguards Framework, in addition to how the FOC Donor Principles could be incorporated and to ensure alignment between the two texts.
- Switzerland suggested a more explicit reference to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, linking to the role of the public and private sectors throughout the lifecycle of DPI systems.
- IDRC noted the immense value of engaging the broader multistakeholder community for the FOC Donor Principles, and encouraged Estonia to follow a similar process for the text, in addition to looking ahead to understand how implementation would work for various stakeholders.
- Taiwan highlighted that the APriGF will be held in October in Kathmandu, Nepal, and suggested maintaining dialogue with partners across Asia including through participation in such events.
- Ghana suggested emphasizing interstate and regional collaborations, to help with stakeholders coming on board for the development of the principles.
- Estonia thanked Members for their input and welcomed further comments in writing, and noted agreement with the suggestions which will be explored during the development of the next version of the text, following input from the FOC-AN and public consultation.

