Methodology

Outline of the facilitation of the meeting sessions along with participant input and feedback on the agenda, discussions on how sessions/activities should be run/amended, and general feedback about the meeting.

Session Numbers and Titles
S1: Welcome and Introduction **S2:** Mapping Our Movements **S3:** What Makes a Movement **S4:** Movement Building in a Digital Age **S5:** End of Day Feedback **S6:** Locating Day 1 **S7:** Threats and Challenges **S8:** *[Deepening Stream]* Locating Ourselves and Our Movements **S9:** *[Hacking Stream]* Digital Security in Feminist Movements **S10:** *[Deepening Stream]* Connecting Movement Building to Technology **S11:** *[Hacking Stream]* Unpacking Digital Security Terminology **S12:** Self-care Session **S13:** End of Day Feedback/ Questions About Feminist Internet and Funders **S14:** Unravelling Day 2 **S15:** Feminist Infrastructures for Feminist Organising **S16:** *[Deepening Stream]* Timeline of the Internet **S17:** *[Hacking Stream]* Problem Tree Analysis: Impact, Causes/Roots **S18:** *[Deepening Stream]* Questions on Movement Building Aspects **S19:** *[Hacking Stream]* Mapping Strategies **S20:** Streams Recap **S21:** Self-care session **S22:** [Deepening Stream] Clusters Deep Dive **S23:** [Hacking Stream] Digital Security in Feminist Movements **S24:** Streams Recap and Feminist Principles of the Internet **S25:** Regional Collective Commitments **S26:** Meeting Closing

Day	Session Title	Methodology
Day 1 (Oct 3)	S1: Welcome & Introduction	**Facilitators: Cheekay & Jan** **Jan** introduces who the facilitators are, their role in the meeting, and welcoming participants. **Cheekay** announces participants will not go around the room to individually introduce themselves due to lack of time but challenges everyone to have lunch and dinner with different people every day. Introduction activity Participants are given a few minutes to fill in postcards with details (listed below), then asked to find and chat with someone/a group of people that have the same interests, and then continue to circulate around the room.

- What should people call you
- Location
- Turn ons
- Turn offs
- Preferred pronouns
- Image/drawing of yourself

Jan introduces members of the organising team, people who the participants can ask for help. One person from each team stands up to introduce their team and team members. Communications, logistics and planning, facilitation, documentation and tech.

<u>Announcements</u>

- Participants encouraged to share writing, drawings, videos, other inputs with communications team
- Logistics of departure times, dietary requirements, and reimbursements
- Parameters of documentation: practicing privacy by default, attribution by region in final report, flagging off-the-record sharing, audio recording for internal purposes only, sharing of report before it's finalised
- Participants are invited to contribute to the wiki at wiki.feminist.org, and to be mindful of high-load internet usage due to slow internet speeds
- **Jac** will introduce co-sponsors later in the afternoon

<u>Expectations and agenda setting</u>

Participants are asked to form natural groups of about 5-6 people and answer 2 questions:

1. What are you expecting from this event?
2. What are you contributing (aside from time and attention)?

One thing per paper, and expectations on green paper and contributions on red paper. Groups contribute 3 expectations maximum, and read out to the room by **Cheekay**.

Participants are asked to put up their contributions on the wall themselves throughout the meeting and manage those.

Cheekay: If you realise that you're not contributing what you said you're contributing then change something. Expectations, we will try to manage with you.

Expectations are recorded in the appendix.

Regarding specific requests for discussions, participants are invited to host sessions in the evening, for example discussing/sharing issues around domestic workers, sex workers rights, abortion etc), and also to keep raising them during discussions in their streams.

<u>Main arcs of the meeting</u>

- Day 1: Locate – locating this work, where we are at this moment, look at power structures, how power circulates amongst different kinds of people
- Day 2: Unravel – unravelling issues and questions. Unpicking situation
  - Breaking into 2 different streams:
    - Hacking and digital security
    - Hacking the narrative of digital movements
- Day 3: Strategise – The hack we have and the hack we want
- Day 4: Make – Concrete commitments if possible, to imagine again, and to start constructing this internet we want.

There's time and space during the evenings and mornings for play. Participants are also reminded that they have journals to write in for reflection throughout the days.

Facilitators invite questions and comments from participants:

- Determining streams: It was stated in the email communications with participants, participants had to apply for particular streams
- Event hashtag: #feministinternet
- Those requesting medical assistance can speak to someone from APC

<u>Privacy and safety</u>

Facilitators explain the colours of the nametags and how they correspond to whether you can take pictures of the person wearing it.

- Green (go for it)
- Orange (ask first)
- Red (no photos/tweets)

As a general rule of thumb, ask first. Photos will only be taken after lunch, after participants have settled nametags and gotten used to them. Participants are also invited to talk to the communications team if they have questions or concerns.

Live-tweeters are asked to please respect the off-the-record principle and to not attribute names and countries.

<u>Values of the meeting</u>

Cheekay asks the participants to help set the values they want for the meeting, which is done by general discussion where participants can voice yes or no.

| | | Value of privacy; collective responsibility to ensure a space that protects all of us, not only about protecting individual privacy — don't geolocate your online updates, don't state location Not a device-free zone but practicing responsible use of devices Step up/Step down. **Cheekay:** If you feel like you've been speaking for the past x minutes, I would urge you to step down. If you feel like an hour has gone by without you speaking, then step up. Practice self-management Respect each other's opinions and each other (Africa) No interruption or talking over others (Europe) Patience about process and time, especially with regards to words, translation and people needing explanations — we're all working to use English as a common language (South Africa) Be mindful of the environment and context here when you communicate to others (Africa) Accept as a default that this space is diverse, and this diversity comes at a cost. As we speak, don't out each other, don't assume pronouns, treat that as earned and privileged information (**Jac**) Assume good intentions when hearing something you don't agree or aren't cool with in conversation (North America/East Africa) Be on time to start on time (Pacific Islands) Don't yuck my yum (Southeast Asia) No question is stupid or invalid. Don't be embarrassed about not knowing each other's contexts (**Cheekay**) If you need a hand, ask someone. There is a lot of wisdom and knowledge in our room; take care of yourself and take care of each other. (Region unknown) **Cheekay** teaches gestures to participants to help them not interrupt when people talk: To ask someone to speak louder – turn on the volume gesture If someone is speaking too fast – wavy hand movement If someone is saying something you don't understand (you can't comprehend or don't know the word) – time out gesture To get people to quiet down – raise your hand. If you see someone raising their hand, stop speaking and raise your hand with them Facilitators wrap up, asks about participants artefacts for the Museum of Moments, and asks them to come back at 11:45am. |
| Day 1 (Oct 3) | S2: Mapping Our Movements | **Facilitators: Jenny and Vale**

Before the session begins, **Cheekay** addresses housekeeping questions from participants. |

- What are the daily timings? The days begin at 9am. Break at 11 to 11.30am. Lunch at 1 to 2.30pm. Come back to streams then and we have a break at around 3.30/4. We plan to end by 6pm everyday
- How do participants find out about evening activities? Posted on the discussion board. A hackspace lead by Mallory every night, and Day 1's sessions are around the wiki and Firefox. Participants can offer to share a skill or do a demo of technology you're using, and also request a skill on the board
- By the end of the day there will be an assigned space where participants can share or sell materials

Volunteers are requested to be eyes and ears for Day 1 and the next three days. Participants can report issues such as logistics or discussions they find problematic and eyes and ears will deliver the feedback to the team.

<u>Introducing the session</u>

Jenny tells participants they will begin the session by modelling what they will do during the session. **Vale** shares a personal story about blocking the parliament in Bosnia in June 2013 to protest the personal identification number system.

Participants are asked to get into groups of five to share their stories linked to their artefacts. Each participant is handed little cards with symbols on them, everyone with the same symbol will group together. They're given five minutes per story, and in the remaining time after the sharing participants come back together to share.

Vale: We want these stories to locate us in our movements. These stories will not only help us know each other, but to show us how far we've come. They will also be displayed in our museum of movements. My story, my artefact, my movement. If you don't have the artefact, that's okay. Think of one moment, and one activity, to share so that the people know you and where you are.

Jenny: How do we create our stories – Vale modelled this. The personal is political – your story is your story. You can't really tell the story of another person, you have to locate yourself in that story. Listen deeply, listen with all your senses — listen for a memorable moment. Listen to what makes you curious about that story, and note what sparked it.

Vale: Take care of each other, sometimes it's not easy to tell your story. Listen to cues where someone is struggling, give time, attention, generous feedback, and write things down. It's about caring, so if it starts becoming difficult, ask us for help. Our stories are also sometimes incredibly funny. Show, don't tell; it's not a donor report or a newspaper article, it's a moment, a personal experience, it's about your feelings, your heart, your whole body. A story or a conversation you'd want

		to share with friends. We'll chat about how we're going to capture these. <u>Documentation</u> • Jot down your thoughts and what you'd like to share back to the person in your journals while listening to the stories • Write down your own story, what details are listed, if you want to be anonymous, so the storytellers can decide if they want to share the story and how they're gonna share • In the plenary, share feedback on how the process was for you generally and what did you learn. We want these stories to live beyond this moment. Participants disperse with 30–35 minutes to share their stories before returning for a plenary where they share their thoughts, feelings, and stories about how they found the experience. **Jenny** wraps up nearing to lunch time, thanks participants for sharing and asks them to come back at 2.45pm, and announces that from 8pm to 9.30pm they will have a continuation and deepening of the Museum of Moments process.
Day 1 (Oct 3)	S3: [Input] What Makes a Movement, and Why Does it Matter?	**Input person: Srilatha who will be giving the presentation "What Makes A Movement, and Why Does It Matter?", introduced by Jac** *Srilatha's presentation inputs are recorded in the report.* At the end of her presentation, **Srilatha** addresses questions directly from participants, with the help of some facilitators to take questions, cluster them, note them, and pass around microphones.
Day 1 (Oct 3)	S4: [Input] Movement Building in a Digital Age	**Input person: Jac, who will be giving the presentation "Movement Building in a Digital Age"** **Jac** asks the participants to do an activity before the presentation begin. They are asked to stand in a circle, and to step forward each time they have felt the following (spoken aloud by **Jac**): • That they have at least one collaborator in their work • That they are part of a collective • That they are part of a network • That they are part of a coalition • That they are part of a transnational alliance At the end of the activity, many of the participants find themselves at the centre of the circle, while some find themselves on the margins. **Jac** notes that participants are all differently located and that this is akin to the relationship of

		the movement — people are organised differently and that, in her opinion, this is part of the movement's strength. **Jac** notes that the closer people are to the middle, the more power they have. She urges people not to forget the individuals at the edges, who are also part of the movement but are connected in different ways. **Jac** clarifies that her presentation is a distillation of many conversations she has had with people who have been trying to figure out movement building. She calls it an exercise in figuring things out together. *Jac's presentation inputs are recorded in the report.* **Jac** ends her presentation with questions regarding movement building and how they think of it for the group to mull over together. The floor is opened for questions and comments from participants. Other facilitators assist in taking questions, clustering them, noting them, and passing around microphones.
Day 1 (Oct 3)	S5: End of Day Feedback	**Cheekay** asks participants to post their thoughts on 3 coloured post-its: • Yellow for a-ha! Moments • Pink for what they want the facilitators to improve the next day • Green for what they're curious about for the next few days Participants liked sharing personal stories, reflecting on models of organising, shifting away from online/offline binaries, domains of change and power, and working in small groups. They want better time management, concrete examples accompanying theories and concepts, more varied activities focusing on group participation and less on 'lecture' style. They had questions on sustainability, self-care, surviving power transitions, formulating balanced strategies, feminist internet infrastructure, inclusion, making impact, understanding history of feminism developing on the internet, and how technology reinforces power in terms of class. *Full feedback is recorded in the appendix.* She then tells them to approach her if they have material to display or sell, so that they can figure out a space for them. Timings and spaces for the evening sessions are announced.

		A rapporteur asks people to clearly state their regions when they are speaking, so that this can be recorded. She also asks people to ask for translators if they need one, and urges people who speak English to speak slowly so that everyone can understand them.

Day 2 (Oct 4)	S6: Locating Day 1	**Facilitators: Sandra and Vale**
		
		Facilitators begin by asking the seated participants to get up and sit next to somebody they don't already know. The session covers housekeeping and agenda summary and overview.
		
		<u>Housekeeping</u>
		
		Facilitators address feedback that concerns logistics and meeting management given by participants from the previous day.
		
		• Positive feedback
		   ○ **Vale**: You liked the storytelling when you were the center of your own stories, you liked the input.
		• Air conditioning
		   ○ **Vale**: We can open and close windows and try to be patient with each other.
		• Eyes and ears:
		   ○ Volunteers requested and then identified to participants
		   ○ **Vale:** It was very useful to hear from eyes and ears from the previous day. If you have a need, tell them to the eyes and ears or any of us from APC, for anything from logistics to sensitive topics.
		• Identification
		   ○ Participants asked to state their name and country before providing comments or feedback in plenary/throughout the meeting. Names won't be recorded but this is for the purposes of documentation and introduction/familiarisation for other participants
		   ○ Participants asked to make sure they are wearing their name tags, or to make a new one if they do not have one
		• Language
		   ○ Participants are pointed to a support person for French to English translation. Language support also available for Spanish, Chinese to English and Indonesian to English
		• Jargon Jar
		   ○ Introduced to participants as a sheet on the wall open for anyone to write down words or acronyms they don't understand. For example, FOMO (fear of missing out) and FOBI (fear of being included) from yesterday's discussions.
		• Wiki

		- Participants are asked to note or take a picture of a sheet outlining login details for the wiki, which is for them to contribute resources and personal stories. **Mallory** is available for any questions about the wiki. - Time management **Vale**: Yesterday you weren't happy about this. This is a collective responsibility. We were thinking of being strict but at 9am there were five people here. So if we want to be responsible and to have sensible time management, consider that we only have four days together. Starting on time is the only way we can manage. <u>Agenda summary</u> **Vale** addresses feedback from participants about lack of clarity in the overall agenda and concerns about having enough time and space for participant-driven and participant-led discussions. - Day 1 was just to locate. We were given some inputs, but that doesn't mean that that's the only thing we'll talk about. It was intense so maybe some of you feel there wasn't time and space to give your input. We just opened yesterday, over the next three days we will have time for more input. We set the ground, which means the framework can be revised. - Today (Day 2) is unravelling. Tomorrow (Day 3): strategy, talking about the hack we have and the hack we want. Why hacking? Hacking is wanting to understand something. The feminist movement is hacking all the time. We rename, create different alternative realities, that one day who knows, will be mainstreamed. Hopes never die. - Day 4 is the making, where we imagine to make and plan together. Sometimes we expect so much from Day 1, to set the questions but also all the answers. We may not have all the answers by Day 4 but the best is to have a plan to figure out how to find the answers. **Vale:** Those are the four days and how we think this convening should work. There is space and time for everything. This is space that can cause dissent. It's not about having all the same ideas but being able to listen to all the diversity and finding the ways in which our diversity can work together in a common way. If some feel the ones who speak louder have more power, this is just an impression. Find your own way to be louder the way you wish to be. <u>Streams</u> **Vale** then explains the two streams, who they are for, what each stream's objectives are, and how many people are in

each stream. Participants will move into their streams today before lunch; with clarification on who is in which stream and how many people are in each stream.

- Stream: hacking digital security
    - 30 people
    - Facilitators: **Cheekay**, **Jenny**, and **Sandra**
    - For people who have participated in digital security training, have attended digital security workshops. It's not about learning, tools or skills, this is a conversation about Making a Feminist Internet. We can share some skills, but during evening sessions.

- Stream: deepening of narratives in the digital age
    - 40 people
    - Facilitators: **Jac, Jan** and **Vale**
    - We'll be trying to understand the intersectionality; we don't look at technology alone but we look at feminist movement building

Feedback

Participants are asked if they want to bring up any thoughts or feelings from yesterday that resonated with them.

Participant from West Europe suggests sharing what participants think they want to share here as opposed to just having a glossary of what the organisers/facilitators want to share with participants. To instead share the imaginaries, or how we are conceiving technology, or security or safety? Suggestion to have cloud words to see what meanings participants assign from their practices and actions.

Vale responds by saying one way this will be addressed will be within the stream, and that **Jac** will oversee a sheet for participants to put keywords to build up a common glossary or taxonomy by the end of the day.

Jac thinks this is a great idea and connects to a great exercise on terminology brought up by **Jenny**, to discuss how some terms in movement building – intersectionality, for example, have shifted. This exercise could be done as part of nightplay/evening sessions.

Credits

Vale notes this was a session they intended for the end of Day 1 but ran out of time for, and that it is to introduce the community of people that came together to make the meeting happen. She passes the session to **Jac**.

Jac notes the diversity of the room and the huge amount of knowledge and history attached to everyone and the fields they are a part of. The intersection of this knowledge,

		technology, and movement building is the common thread between all collaborators here. **Jac** shares how her activism started with the issue of domestic violence and it moved to technology and feminism. The internet is changing things on a fundamental level and can transform how feminists deal with power, which is crucial in all feminisms. **Jac** then describes the beginnings of the meeting, which wasn't programmed, and the collaborators that are a part of realising the meeting. She introduces representatives from different organisations and individuals. *The full text of **Jac**'s speech is recorded in the appendix.* Facilitation is passed over to **Bob** for the next session. Participants are asked to state with a show of hands who knows how to do feminist infrastructure and who knows how the internet works. These participants are asked to have lunch together with facilitators to plot for following sessions.

Day 2 (Oct 4)	S7: [Input] Threats and Challenges	**Input person: Jac**
		
		Jac asks participants if they remembered what they were doing the first time they went online. Most of the room remembers finding a feeling of community online.
		
		Answers:
		● Neopets
		● AOL
		● Myspace
		● Netspace
		● Napster
		● mIRC and other chatrooms
		    ○ When I was 15, I discovered a whole world where I could talk to people (South Asia)
		    ○ I could be someone else and have cybersex (Southeast Asia)
		
		Participants also agrees with **Jac** that there's something about being online that makes possible something that was not possible before. She points out that this is a key shift in power.
		
		Questions posed by **Jac** before beginning the presentation:
		
		● What is this shift in power?
		● What does power mean to you originally, and
		● what does power mean to you in terms of how you're organising to shift power? ("Shifting power is, after all, essentially the feminist project.")
		● What kinds of power does organising end up shifting, and
		● What power has already shifted?

		Jac explains that this presentation was prepared for the Stockholm Internet Forum and is on five layers of power in terms of organising around and through the Internet.
		Comments and questions are given/asked throughout the presentation. **Jac** asks participants to raise one finger before speaking to raise a new point, and two to speak to a point previously raised.
		Post-presentation plenary
		At the end of the discussion, participants are offered the option for discussion in groups or in plenary. The majority choose plenary.
		Mid-discussion, **Jac** seeks clarification and consensus from the participants between the terms "digital technologies" and "the Internet", and participants agree to move forward with the discussion to focus on digital technologies instead of the Internet which is an element of it.
		Splitting into streams
		Participants then move into two streams to make the space and time for discussions around: • What has shifted in our movements • Issues and challenges in terms of our movement building work • Intersections • The way we should organise some of these issues we are working on • What are some of the strategies we put into place to respond to some of this (the strategies could be anything in terms of building collaboration building knowledge and figuring out what else is needed)
Day 2 (Oct 4)	S8: [Deepening Stream] Locating Ourselves and Our Movements	**Facilitator: Jac** Mapping relationships within personal activisms and movements **Jac:** Yesterday, the group was trying to figure out what has shifted in the ecosystems of movements, new ways of organising, actors, etc. Today we'll unpack this further, and then intersect the conversation about technology into it. Participants are asked to remember a particular question in their application forms which asked them their primary location in terms of their activism. The question is reproduced below: How would you describe the location of your activism? Please select at most 3 answers • I'm an individual node that connects between different networks/movements

| | | Informal collective Cooperative Grassroots based Non-profit organisation Social media networking Coalition Donor/funder Other:
Participants are asked to choose their primary location (based on the options from the form) and split into groups. The biggest group is collective, and so they're asked to split into smaller groups.

Jac asks if anyone is having trouble choosing a location.

South Asia/West Europe: Is the individual node on its own?

Jac: No, the individual node is the one that connects, and moves from space to space but doesn't commit to one space.

Once the participants have split into groups, they are asked to map out their relationships in the following manner:
Actors they perform everyday labour with
Actors they rely on for support and solidarity
Relationships of resource and knowledge
Relationships of care
Jac: You can draw bigger or smaller dots for certain people. We don't want names, but you can think of buckets of categories, such as local NGOs. If this doesn't make sense, you can figure it out as a group, because we are making this up as we go along. It's more helpful if you do it individually and then pool together – then your aggregated map is of a big universe.

Participants are given 20 minutes to do the exercise. After the activity, all the maps that have been generated are put side by side, so that all the participants can examine them and then discuss.

Jac asks participants how the exercise was and if it was frustrating, if they saw things they didn't expect. Participants generally respond "No." She asks them to start with commonalities.

Jac shares a personal realisation when she was trying to similarly map APC's universe. Even though they squarely locate themselves within the women's movement, this exercise caused them to ask themselves what relationship they have with the women's movement beyond relationships of resource and knowledge sharing. For example, relationships of support and solidarity, and everyday labour? Perhaps these are relationships of the future, that are missing now. She asks if participants had similar revelations or if the maps showed them something they had not seen before. |

		*Participants share their responses, moderated with input/responses from **Jac**. Their responses are recorded in the report.* Towards the end of the session, **Jac** notes that the conversation is a very interesting one, that care is a very interesting – often complicated, often transactional relationship, and that they haven't yet asked the question of how technology intersects with these relationships. The session ends so participants can break for lunch.

Day 2
(Oct 4)
	S9: [Hacking Stream] Digital Security in Feminist Movements	**Facilitators: Cheekay (main), Jenny, and Sandra**
		
		Participants are asked to reintroduce themselves to each other by stating their name and one thing they're really really really good at. There are about 20 participants; roughly 21 countries and 11 regions are represented by both participants and facilitators.
		
		Introductions are recorded in the appendix.
		
		<u>Agenda Summary</u>
		
		Participants are asked if they've participated in security trainings or are security trainers. Not everybody has or is. **Cheekay** then runs through the agenda for the stream for the next three days. She states the facilitators/organisers had assumed there was going to be a flow to the streams, but they now want to break those assumptions and break the stream.
		
		Cheekay: Let me write the plan out so we can hack it and break it.
		
		Day 2
		● Look at the role of the Digital Security Trainer in our feminist movements
		● In the afternoon (second session for the stream on Day 2): Problematise the issue as to why our feminist movements are not secure
		    ○ To focus not just on the roots of it but also the impacts of it on our movements
		
		Day 3
		● Following the arc of the overall gathering. Today is unravelling; problematising the whys and the impacts of our movements not being secure. Tomorrow we get to strategising:
		    ○ Strategising discussions
		    ○ What are the strategies we need to be recommending to the bigger movements, the donors, around making our movements more resilient
		    ○ We should move away from security as an end goal but security as a process, security as being resilient

Day 4
- It's about building and making
- This might not work within the configuration of the room but we're thinking of doing a quick sprint around training methodologies, so we have something concrete by the end of this

Cheekay: I can see some panic in everyone's faces but don't worry, we can break this apart. APC's Women's program has a set of training methodologies and session times that we wanted to present and then open it up for other people to share their training methodologies and work in small groups to figure that one out for something concrete. But I'm not sure if that will work.

Cheekay thinks there should be three alpha discussions (based on what she heard in the comments of the plenary), but first participants of this stream need to have a discussion to come to terms with what we mean by digital security, technology, internet, security, safety, before figuring out strategies. She asks if that is the same feeling in the room, and participants agree.

Cheekay: Our plan is written in erasable ink, so we can change it.

Plan written on the board:
1. Defining / Redefining
2. Analysis: Why Are Our Feminist Movements Not Secure
3. Feminist Approaches to —
4. Practical Strategies to Make Our Feminist Movements More—
5. Fleshing Out The Strategies

Expectations

A participant (Southeast Asia) asks if everyone can share their expectations going into the stream. **Cheekay** asks participants what are you hoping to get out of the stream? We're digging deep into issues of security, specifically security and feminist movement building, so what do we want to get out of this that will be meaningful for everyone?

A selection of participants' expectations are recorded in the report.

A participant (MENA) states their expectation as "learning about how to coordinate with other activists through a safe channel where this data can't be used by the government to prosecute the activists. Which feminist servers might be used, which apps are more risky than the others."

Cheekay notes that she doesn't think this can be covered in the streams as they're veering the streams away from skill-based or even tool-based solutions and another format in this event might cover that.

A participant suggestion that the setting of the room is changed into a circle. "There's a social technology through the 80s which is in a circle, we are on the same level." (West Europe)

After hearing everyone's expectations, **Cheekay** notes that they have differing but not necessarily conflicting expectations and summarises what she understands from the room's input:

- Approach: "How do we approach security from feminist perspective, in our context. Again that sentence in and of itself is loaded because then you have to unpack what do we mean by feminist approach or security?"
- Practical training methods: "For the people who identify as trainers, that's why they're here. To share methodologies and effective ways, even to raise awareness on digital security as part of a training methodologies arc."
  - **Cheekay** can see this connected to a discussion around why are our feminist movements not secure. Instead of trying to force them to understand the importance, flip it to ask why are they not making it important. "We have feminist proactive approaches, we go deeper into defense tactics and dealing with attacks or assisting people who are dealing with attacks."

Cheekay: Am I right to assume that many people in this room play a role in providing support to other feminists who have been attacked? Generally, most of the participants agree.

- Assumptions around who are the feminists we provide support for — are they city based or rural feminists as well?
- A bigger discussion around the shape of technology as we have inherited it.
  - "We have admitted that, in most cases — unless we have technical privilege, we are living and using technology that's compromised from the start, that's vulnerable, that doesn't allow for deletion — that might be an approach discussion as well."
  - "There's privilege in saying let's create our own technology. What does it mean by saying that, to talk about creating our own technology with our own values"

She asks if she's covered everything or if she's missed anything out of the expressed expectations? The ensuing discussion weaves expectations into the overall four-day agenda and this is then used to guide the direction for the stream.

Jenny: There's some space to talk about how we can work together afterwards. I said digital security and holistic security is not just about training, but what's crucial is how we support each other in every aspect. This is an amazing moment to go deep — I'd like to know how we can stay connected in a secure way to support each other.

From these discussions, **Cheekay** notes they have a new idea for the stream, but wants to check in on whether her usage of "digital security" as a term is triggering for people. Generally, participants agree to use that phrase first and it can be discussed later.

Cheekay: We can have an activity after lunch where we can unpack such things, to reach some kind of consensus on an approach that we think is feminist around digital security.

West Europe 1: I would like that we frame the conversation around what we can achieve and what we could realistically achieve, because I'm sure there's so many things we want.

Cheekay: Before we can even discuss realistic achievements, we need to unpack some of the terms, we need to have some time to discuss what these terms mean for us. I'm assuming it means something, but it might mean something completely different to other people. It's very similar to what someone (Latin America / Caribbean) mentioned [from the morning session] about cloud words.

West Europe 2: I think as part of this conversation, the way that you mention it before you set on the agenda, we should have a discussion on why our movements are not yet secure. We need to understand not the risk we are facing but why we don't prioritise — despite all the challenges activists are facing, young feminist activists don't prioritise security.

Jenny: Looking overall at the way the agenda is structured, the expectations can fit into that. Maybe where we can start this afternoon is why our movements are not secure — so we can unpack and unravel.

A participant (Latin America / Caribbean) notes concern about the usage of the term "security" and its connection to surveillance in their context. A conversation on language/linguistics ensues.

This conversation is recorded in the report.

Cheekay: These are good suggestions. We can build a stream that we will all be reasonably okay with. We will acknowledge the expectations in the arc of the stream, while acknowledging the arc of the overall event.

Cheekay announces an activity in the afternoon to unpack and even begin to rename. certain terms encountered a often in digital security. Digital security as a term itself, technology,

		risk management, feminism/feminist. Participants are asked to think of words they want to unpack.

MENA: Public/private. Real/unreal — also very important.

Latin America / Caribbean: Is there a chance to unpack our feelings of this — anger, hysterical, sadness — this kind of thing we can't move.

Cheekay: Maybe we unpack words that trigger those feelings. We'll think about it. Not just to remain on a head level, but feelings and the body.

Southeast Asia: Sustainability.

Cheekay: Resilience is another word.

The words are noted to be discussed in the next session after lunch before the session is wrapped up. |
| Day 2 (Oct 4) | S10: [Deepening Stream] Connecting Movement Building to Technology | **Facilitator: Jac**

Mapping how the digital landscape has changed movement building

Jac: We didn't get to where we wanted to go with the earlier conversation. It felt disconnected – how do we make it about movement building in a digital age?

The plan is to split the participants into smaller groups to discuss how the digital landscape has changed the following steps (in terms of actors, ways of organising, where organising happens, sites of struggle, impact, and shape and rhythm):

1. Perception of injustice
2. Inspired, determined leadership
3. Space for critical analysis/woke-ness/consciousness raising
4. Building a shared political agenda
5. Organise and expand "constituency" base
6. Figure out strategies and actions
7. Visibility/backlash

The participants have a debate on how to have this discussion. Highlights:

- **Jac** asks if participants wants to have the conversations with their friends or randomly
- Question on whether their identities and contexts should be discussed first (Southeast Asia)
  - **Jac** notes that context always matters but at the same time it doesn't necessarily have to be the window for this discussion – it could also be about areas of emphasis i.e whether a participant finds themselves working on one step more than another. |

		Jac intervenes and says too much time is being spent on this debate. Participants are asked to break into groups and based on their group, they negotiate how they want to have this conversation.
		
		The participants split into groups of five and the discussion begins.
		
		<u>Post-discussion plenary</u>
		
		Jac asks each of the groups to share a couple of highlights and challenges, and reminds to them to practice step up and step down so that participants are not spending too much or too little time sharing.
		
		After the participants share their discussions, **Jac** shares her observation and summary of what she's heard:
		
		• Some tensions have come up around visibility – when it works, when it doesn't, how you influence it.
		• There is tension also around access, since there is tonnes of information, but also too much information.
		  ○ The ability to influence discourse properly, shifts in rhythm, pace, organising, privacy and anonymity are all part of this.
		    ■ In some sense, anonymity is really important and tactical, and sometimes brings up issues around accountability.
		• Security is interesting too – sometimes it makes you a hell of a lot more secure, and at other times it makes you more vulnerable.
		
		Jac thanks the participants, and they break for tea and coffee.

Day 2 (Oct 4)	S11: [Hacking Stream] Unpacking Digital Security Terminology	**Facilitators: Cheekay (main), Jenny, and Sandra** **Cheekay:** This is how far we've gone in imagining what will happen to this stream. So today we will try to define and redefine concepts, not to reach a consensus but beyond the same page as far as how people define things, some clarity about where people are coming from when we say certain words and what do they mean for us? Words • Feminist approach • Resilience • Digital security • Sustainability • Risk management • Online violence • Hacking or to be hacked <u>Activity</u> The words are written out on big sheets of paper and posted up around the room. Participants are told to start with

| | | individual definitions. One concept and idea per post-it and per person, although participants are not limited to contributing just one definition/concept/idea.

Step 1: Post these individual definitions on the walls next to the words they relate to.
Step 2: Group together to cluster similar definitions for one particular word they are interested in unpacking.

Cheekay: Maybe there are very different opinions on defining a word. And then after we cluster definitions perhaps we can start thinking about maybe renaming some of these terms from a perspective that— again, not to build consensus it's not about consensus or forcing anyone to subscribe to a definition, just us being on the same page on how everyone defines these terms. So no one experience is more valid than the other.

┌───┐
│ *New participant (East Africa) arrives to the room* │
└───┘

<u>Post-activity debrief</u>

Once the activity was over, participants are asked about their experiences with the definitions, with **Cheekay** emphasising a focus on the former rather than the latter.

Questions from **Cheekay**

• What did you find as far as how people defined a concept?
• Are there definitions that were the same across the board?
• Are there some that were the opposite of what you were expecting?

The clustering and unpacking of the terms and definitions is recorded in the report. |
| Day 2 (Oct 4) | S12: Self-Care | **Facilitator: Sandra**

Sandra checks the temperature of the room – whether the participants have the energy to continue discussion or if they would like to use 30 minutes to spend on some body work and self care. The consensus is body work and self-care.

Sandra: This is in terms of walking the talk about politics of self-care, since we talked about resilience. We didn't do this yesterday so let's do this today where we make space to talk about collective care amongst ourselves. There is a lot happening here, we're far away from home, and there are many things happening at home, a lot of anxieties and baggage. I was thinking it might be good that we try and do exercises to contain some of this within our bodies.

Instructions for the exercise are recorded in the report. |

<u>Post-exercise debrief</u>

Sandra asks participants to sit with her and have a conversation, she asks them how they feel.

Responses:
- Nice
- Relaxed
- Peaceful
- Could feel myself getting in touch with my internal flow
- What I liked was allowing yourself to slow down and be quiet. To lay still until we feel a shift, force yourself to feel it.
- It was a moment to allow myself to connect to myself. It's slowing down and relaxing but it's about being with myself. Sometimes we are all over the place, but we forget the importance of connecting with our own energy.
- There's a collective power in doing it together.

Sandra expands and explains about the impact of the exercises:

- Humans, even as grown-ups, react immediately to touch, and it is the quickest way to self-soothe
- There are many ways to self soothe, such as meditation, slower methods, jogging, and those work for some people but not for everyone
- Something like this is for people who survive severe trauma
- Maybe we will have time for the rest of the two days to learn in pairs — to show different tools in your communities, it's how we practice what we preach
- In taking this time — it's not about what's supposed to happen but learning the language of your body. Our bodies remember more than ourselves. Any time we are touched by somebody else, our body is very suspicious. And then it just sinks.
- Lying on your back is one of the most vulnerable positions. For many people, if you allow them to choose how they lie down on the floor, they lie down on their stomachs so they can hide themselves from the world. So natural. The posture we did is very exposing, this is how you make yourself vulnerable but also seen. Very often we try to hide and build walls. This is also one of the ways we see each other and allow ourselves to be seen. This is the point of our connection, when we see our vulnerabilities. Also the point of our creativity where we innovate and create together
- This is one of the simplest techniques, that is so powerful how it works.

Participant from Latin America / Caribbean suggests including these exercises in some way for the next two days, at the start of the day or ending the day with this energy. "I think

		that we talk many times of collective self care and the importance of self care but we don't practice it in this way."
		Sandra says yes, if there's enough time and if people commit to making time for it.
Day 2 (Oct 4)	S13: End of Day Feedback/ Questions About Feminist Internet and Funders	**Facilitators: Jac, Sandra, and Vale**
		Jac tells participants that they require some collective decision making to decide how to proceed with the last session of the day. She presents two options around issues that have cropped up, and participants can only choose one as there's not enough time to do both.
		A. Feminist infrastructure: getting a sense of how the internet works, who governs our data and why that matters, regulation, censorship, surveillance. What is making a feminist internet and what does it have to do with movement building. That takes an hour and we're not sure if we have time for that
		B. Conversation with the donors and funders in the room: space for participants to talk to them, ask why they came here, their thoughts on movement building, throw them trolling questions from the floor. We thought would be a good thing to do. This would also be an hour
		Jac notes that since they've also been discussing practices of self and collective care that participants could choose to have some journalling time and there's a lot to process.
		Jac: There was also a wonderful intention to end the day by dancing together.
		<u>Participant discussion on next steps</u>
		Participant from MENA asks if the donors in the room can make themselves visible. **Sandra** asks if that should be a conversation to be had now, and **Jac** notes that perhaps the donors and funders aren't fully prepped for a conversation right now.
		Participant from SEA says they've gotten into a meditative mode, **Jac** agrees. Participant from Latin America / Caribbean suggests journalling.
		Jac: Okay, but think about time as a scarce resource. You can journal for 15 minutes but then also think in the back about your mind about what your priorities are and maybe we have to give something up and that's okay.
		South Asia: If we don't do either of these things now – do we do them tomorrow, or does it mean we don't do them at all?
		Participant from West Europe adds that tonight during the feminist hackerspace evening activity, feminist infrastructure

may be covered in conversations around initiatives and histories of feminist servers and services.

Participant from Africa suggests writing down 1–2 questions each for feminist infrastructure and for the donors and funders. **Jac** thinks this is a good idea, and asks participants to spend 15 minutes journalling and thinking of these questions.

Questions on feminist infrastructure and donors and funders are recorded in the appendix.

Stream sharing and closing

Vale asks participants to post their questions on the wall and promises that the organisers will not filter the questions. She then asks for quick recaps from the discussions of each stream, so everyone can get a quick sense of the day.

Deepening

Oceania: I was in the deepening stream, in the subgroup on collectives. Some of the things were discussed were:

- Looking at the everyday labour we put in, the solidarity and support we receive and who are the actors that provide us with it
- Looking at care – how we care in the collective and for the collective
- Discussing one more category – resources and knowledge – who and what it comes from
- After lunch, we did a different activity, not based on subgroups but focused on a series of questions around movement building – in my group, we looked at how to set the political agenda – how it is formulated and developed in the digital space, and how power shifts and manifests in the digital space.

South Asia 1: Key insights that came out from the entire discussion on deepening:

- First of all it is important to share the exercise we did in the morning of trying to map the ecosystem in which we operative and fitting that into the digital lens didn't actually work. So the methodology was changed, and it was powerful.
- In the afternoon we used the movement building steps and process map I had presented yesterday, and tried to look at how digital organising has affected or skewed these steps if you're trying to do it with digital organising methods.
  - In digital movement building, a lot of these steps don't take place in that sequence and it doesn't necessarily determine how you go. You may build your political agenda first, then start mobilising. Or you go straight to action, then

start to think of bringing in a constituency base.

○ In a sense, a lot of essential challenges and dilemmas of any kind of social justice movement that we have been facing for the last several centuries (such as – how are we actually bringing in the people most affected by an issue? Are they really shaping the agenda? Are they able to represent themselves?) remain. But they have taken on new shapes because technology has changed the nature of those challenges. We are in the process of figuring out how to meet them.

○ Issues around how you make movement building inclusive, democratic and accountable assume a new set of complexities when a large part of constituencies aren't even part of the digital world.

<u>Hacking</u>

South Asia 2: Today, I think what we did in both sessions was challenge our assumptions. The first assumption was about how we thought the sessions would go. We discovered that we came in with different ideas and assumptions – so we had a discussion around that, and came up with all the expectations.

In the second session, we did an exercise where we took buzzwords from previous session, and defined them for ourselves, clustered the definitions and discussed them. We use some words and we take for granted that everyone understands. But even words like digital security mean very different things for different people. Based on that, we came up with an agenda, including a problem statement we'll be working on.

MENA: It was interesting to look at digital security itself as a patriarchal structure, that was built in a way that was not secure, as a result of which we were vulnerable within it. Having that perspective in the background has helped a lot in being political, and the way we analyse digital security.

Vale: If there are no other insights, we can smoothly end the day. Keep working on your journal.

Participants are reminded that although it is not compulsory, they can give feedback in terms of their a–ha moments, what they want to understand more or change, and to put these on the board.

In feedback, participants commented on power relations, the need for collective strategising and locating accountability, enabling the creation of community and leadership in the digital age, and they enjoyed the discussion in the deepening stream.

		They want more vegetarian options for dinner, more self-care elements, better time management, less intellectualist conversation that does not exclude people based on education, and more careful language that does not trigger people (referring to a casual comment on suicide / self-harm from a facilitator). They had questions on the responsibility of the collective on individual self-care, interrogating class within conversations, and requested a feminist digital movement building dictionary and toolkit. *Full feedback is recorded in the appendix.* **Vale** asks the participants to applaud themselves, and there are logistics announcements around evening activities and airport transfers.
Day 3 (Oct 5)	S14: Unravelling Day 2	**Facilitators: Bob, Geeta and Srilatha** The morning begins with a song of indigenous women from the province that **Srilatha** comes from; she says the song is full of fun and innuendo. It is about how a young woman has gone into a forest to collect firewood, berries and beans – but she hasn't come back, so the community wonders who she's with and what she's up to. **Srilatha** leads the participants and they sing the song in the call and response style. <u>Agenda summary</u> **Bob** provides an overview of the results of the discussion at the end of Day 2 about which session to have – feminist infrastructure or donors and funders – and the questions submitted by participants on both. From the questions for donors, the organisers realised there were two camps — those related to information exchange on the funding process, and those related to more ideological issues around the role of a donor and philanthropy in a more general sense in this space. To address the former, for the first half hour of lunch, donors and funders in the room will be stationed in the lounge next door to meet with participants who want to get answers. The other more theoretically ideological conversation will be addressed inside the streams. That then leaves space this morning's first session on deconstructing the infrastructure of the internet, with a group of participants leading (those **Bob** gathered from the end of S6 on Day 2). Then there will be a break for tea and coffee before participants go back to their streams, to interrogate to the next level and incorporate some of the things they will unpack this morning into the stream conversations. Then another tea and coffee break, another session in streams,

		then come back as a group to cross-pollinate and "river", and then self-care. Housekeeping - Eyes and Ears - Volunteers for today are identified, participants reminded they can go to these people to share feedback about anything regarding the meeting - Identification - Participants are reminded to say their name and region before comments for the rapporteurs - Wiki - Participants encouraged to populate it with resources so it will live on. **Bob:** It's a great way to stay connected and share information. I encourage ppl who are posting things to the listserv, to post to the wiki. The mic is then passed on to **Erika** who is assisting with the facilitation of the next session.
Day 3 (Oct 5)	S15: Feminist Infrastructures for Feminist Organising	**Facilitators: Bob and Erika** **Erika** guides the splitting of the participants: - Participants are asked to stand and fold their arms. They split into two groups according to who has their right arm on top and who has their left arm on top - The group who had their right arm on top are asked to clasp their hands together, and those who have their right hands on top are asked to separate into a third group - One or two resource persons (from the participant group) are assigned to each group **Erika:** We will give the instructions to everyone in here. The larger group will stay inside and the two smaller groups can do this anywhere they choose to. Participants are given a stack of papers that have different parts of a radio network, a mobile network, and the internet. **Erika:** You will have to figure out amongst yourself, figure out how these networks work. You have to embody it. Come back here and show the embodiments of how your networks work, and yes, you can explain it. You don't have to be silent as you embody but if you want to be silent then you can, it's your decision as a group. Is the instruction clear? Participants are given 10 minutes to do this activity. Group Presentations

Groups present their embodiments twice — once without elaboration and once with elaboration. After every presentation, other participants are invited to contribute comments and questions.

Discussions after the presentations are recorded in the report.

Radio

Passing the phrase (by voice) "The feminist internet is live" through a line of people, who each say it in a different way. Each person holds a piece of paper representing an element: white noise, music voice, mic, cables, sound mixer, computer, cables, radio transmitter, antenna, radio.

Bob asks if anything was missing.

South Africa: Where was the license to broadcast?

Latin America / Caribbean: It's a pirate radio. There was this question about the license — it's an issue in most countries that we don't have spectrum space to transmit it. Regulating the infrastructure of the radio it was cool – there are movements (like we have in our country) where we are trying to get a piece of the spectrum so everyone can share it and use it.

Mobile

The participants announce that the title of their embodiment is When [Participant] Emails Herself. The process of sending the email is embodied through high fives, symbolising the signal transmission travelling between and through different nodes. As before, participants hold pieces of paper representing elements of the network: the message itself, router, local admin, wireless service provider, antenna, local wireless service provider, server. Participants elaborate on the process when presenting a second time:

- It started with Participant writing the email
- I sent it through the router
- The email first hits the router and then you see the email go across
- Then it goes to the wireless service provider
- Then the service provider who has been buying time on the mobile network carrier
- Then the antenna
- Back to wireless service provider and/or
- The local admin chooses the server which was nearer to where it was headed
- They send back a signal, there is more high-fiving and then the message comes back

Internet

Participants show the process of an email being sent via commercial servers and then via a feminist server. Each

participant holds a piece of paper representing a different element of this process. They elaborate on the embodiment in their second presentation:

- One participant is sending an email to another participant and they're both using the same email service – Gmail
- The email goes through the router
- Then it goes through WiFi service
- Then you need to go through your country internet provider that pings the data through an optic fibre cable
- There's a bunch of routers that pings but because it's Gmail it goes through the google servers where it's copied and advertising is attached — Google reads the email, takes the data and copies it, makes a copy of the entire email because it's unencrypted, gives suggestion of advertisements, picks up the keywords
- Then it goes back through the optic fibre cable with the ads
- Then back to the country internet provider who looks at where it's to and from, directs it
- It goes to the router
- And then you read the email with the ads

The process changes when one participant decides to use a feminist server to send an email to the other participant who is still using Gmail:

- It goes from the feminist server to the internet service provider, which is the country internet provider
- It goes through to Google again, because it's from the feminist server but addressed to a Gmail account
- Process of copying and ads happens again
- The message comes back to the country internet provider, all the way back to the other participant

North America/East Africa: So they either both have to be using an encrypted server, or both have to encrypt their emails. So Google can see you're sending an email from the feminist server, but not what's in it.

<u>Plenary Discussion</u>

Bob: The idea for this time is for us to talk a little bit about specific questions or make a comment or ask a question about feminist internet infrastructure.

Participants ask questions that are then answered by the participants leading the session (those with knowledge on infrastructure)

Bob: To the question of what resources exist — if it hasn't been made or is as comprehensive as you need — please post all the resources you know of to the wiki, then maybe there's a group of us that can commit to looking at that to see if

		they're comprehensive enough, do they need to be translated or do they need to be aggregated and added to. **Erika**: I have excellent news, the discussion on feminist servers that was going to happen last night? It did not happen yet. Tonight at 8:30pm, one of the participants will lead a session on feminist servers. **Bob**: That can be in person at 8:30pm and we commit to contributing the wiki. **South Asia:** I was thinking of doing a skillshare tonight about learning about encryption, how to get started, and to clarify some of the concepts. We can do that tonight at 8pm. **Jac** wonders if an oversimplified diagram can be helpful to show some of the connections. She makes it while questions are answered and presents it. **Jac:** So this is not a diagram of how the internet works, I think they will be drawing more specific diagrams about the difference between mobile networks and all that we presented earlier, so the groups will be doing that. I'm hearing some confusion around which aspects we're talking about, so I wanted to address that. *Jac's explanations are recorded in the report.* <u>Housekeeping</u> ● Departures: Check your departure times before tea break and whether you're okay with the time allotted; be mindful of how much time you need to travel to the airport before your flight. If you are going to KL and not the airport, choose a time to do that ● Check out is at noon ● Agenda: Tea break is until 11.30am and afterwards, participants go to the same rooms as yesterday for the streams
Day 3 (Oct 5)	S16: [Deepening Stream] [Input] Timeline of the Internet	**Facilitators: Jac, Jan, and Vale** **Vale** states the purpose of the session, which is trying to build up a timeline of the internet, and asks the participants which year they think the internet started. Participants make guesses of years and mention the military; **Vale** invites elaboration, and then expands on the history with more data and stories. She also invites **Jac** to contribute to the discussion with more storytelling on the history and timeline. Alan Turing, Ada Lovelace, and Donna Haraway are mentioned. **Vale** makes it a special point to mention that though credit for the internet and related technologies are given to men, women have always been a part of the timeline

| | | and history, and that no one person (like Alan Turing) works alone on such an endeavor. "Where are the women of the internet?"

Vale then brings up the earliest sites on the internet – Geocities, Hotmail, and Amazon. She plots out years and which services and events that came out at that time and asks participants to tell her if they've used them or know of them.

Mentioned: Google, ICANN, Napster, Blogger, RiseUp, Indymedia, ICT4D, Creative Commons, Piratebay, World Summit on Information Society (WSIS).

Jac: Do you know when the internet entered your country? Do you know who brought it? Chances are, it's probably a woman. A lot of women academics (like Dr Kanchana Kanchanasut of Thailand) and social justice actors working on rights to development were the ones who first linked internet infrastructure into countries. And the librarians too.

Mentioned: The women recognised in the movie *Hidden Figures*, Ada Lovelace, Grace Hopper. A big award is linked to women in tech, participants are encouraged to find out about it.

Vale and **Jac** mention the role of APC in bringing internet to the Southern African region, how its origins was to be an ISP and this changed when people no longer needed it. **Jan** adds that there are two APC members in the Internet Hall of Fame.

Jac: APC isn't just an organisation – it is a network of members, and part of its badass history is that a lot of individual organisations helped to link activists and other organisations to the internet. It has been part of many interesting movements like the Zapatistas and Yugoslavia – it is really important for us to claim and de-technologise this timeline – and also to talk about the activist timeline. We have always been part of the development of the internet – women have been there from the very beginning.

Discussion of The Beijing Platform for Action in 1995, and the impact and significance of that moment to the women's movement and also how it intersected with the internet and technology.

Jac asks participants if they'd like to pause at this point or carry on, since the group is running out of time. Consensus is that participants would like to carry on.

Discussion of the history of WSIS process, mapping when the governments and banks came in, history of IGF, WSIS forum and universal access fund. **Jan** talks about critique of the whole model of multistakeholderism. There's a critique of the idea that 'everyone is the same' and the fact the corporations are elevated into conversations about governance. |

		Jan elaborates on why they decided to do this session — to remind everyone that we have been here, all the time, at level of technical community, content, bodies occupying space. "It's not outside of our movement."
		
		Group discussion
		
		Jac flags a time problem. Participants have 35 minutes until lunch to unpack and go deeper so that by the afternoon they'll be ready to talk about what to do and how to figure things out.
		
		To address this **Jac** explains the "buckets" of areas that have come out in discussion and the issues and tension between them.
		
		● Leadership/accountability
		  ○ Autonomous leadership
		  ○ Multiple sites
		  ○ Notion of celebrity – where political and social capital coincide, this is a new kind of expression although celebrity is not a new phenomenon, celebrityhood is now an achievable aspiration if you have the money to buy followers
		  ○ Spaces for participation for those who are not in organisations, such as introverts, hidden populations, where anonymity is a critical part of the participation for whatever reason
		  ○ Who is in the movement? Who is accountable to who?
		  ○ Agenda. Must we have a common political agenda? Or must we have multiple agenda, or a common one, but with many different priorities?
		● Constituency
		  ○ Access – to devices, language, to the internet
		  ○ Issues of disparity in public participation
		● Discourse and expression
		  ○ Power
		  ○ The problem of pop – does it strengthen stereotypes, or does it increase empathy?
		  ○ Amplification – sites for activism
		  ○ Grassroots and social media
		● Safety/threat/risk
		  ○ Visibility/anonymity
		  ○ From EROTICS research: anonymity is very important for certain groups to be able to participate
		  ○ Data and context will have impact on this. Safety/threat/risk is also the health of your networks and nodes in relation to your ability to respond.
		● Impact
		  ○ Do we only see it when it is visible? What do we measure, then? Do we use the metrics of eyeballs? Is a hashtag a win?

- - - Access to informal justice. All our structures are failing. Is it just a lot of small wins and no big wins?
  - Ways of organising
    - There are three separations
      - Tech/online activists
      - Social media people, sandwich nodes
      - NGOs
    - They only coalesce when shit hits the fan and don't work together during moments of abeyance
    - We have weird assumptions about each other and this becomes alienating
    - There are also class and intergenerational issues
  - Government and infrastructure
    - As always, we are building our movements on patriarchal structures
    - This is a new, emerging, unfolding patriarchal structure
    - What else do we need to understand about this in order to do our work?

Participants are asked if they know which group they're going to be in and are urged to choose quickly because of the paucity of time. They are asked to use dot stickers with their initials written on them to stick next to the group they want to be in. She identifies the participants who will be the focal points for each bucket. There is a group discussion for 45 minutes. Not every topic gets discussed.

Post-group discussion debrief

Jac asks for key insights from each group. Discussion topics:

- Constituency
- Discourse and expression
- Impact
- Leadership and accountability
- Safety/threat/risk
- Ways of organising
- Infrastructure and governance

Highlights are recorded in the report.

Jac flags that there is another collective decision to make.

Jac: Today and tomorrow we have two and a half more hours on this. By that time we'll have to talk to someone and hammer down particular questions. If you have a particular question, can you write it down now?

Participants post questions and **Jac** reads them out so the group can pick which questions to tackle:

		- Quick run through on the feminist principles of the internet - What is missing from the feminist principles of the internet, how do we develop tools for the implementation and monitoring of the FPI? - How can we encourage feminist movements to see technology as political, i.e. their tech decisions as political ones? - What are the leapfrog opportunities we could create with our collective expertise given that so many brilliant and skilled people are here? - Questions around policy - Questions around movement building - Questions around measuring impact - Questions around accountability - Questions around digital technology - Questions around media tools and using media more meaningfully The group then breaks for lunch.
Day 3 (Oct 5)	S17: [Hacking Stream] Problem Tree Analysis: Impact, Causes/Roots	**Facilitators: Cheekay, Jenny, and Sandra** **Cheekay** explains that what they're doing is problematising the question around feminist movements not prioritising digital security. Participants are asked to break up into groups to have a better discussion and apply an adapted problem tree analysis: - Start with problem statement - Go to the causes/roots of the problem statement - When you're asking the why think about contexts and histories of movements and think of reasons beyond the rational or intellectual — fear of technology is not rational, it's emotional. Think about the causes from the level of the individual, collective, and movement - Of course there will be experiences that are contrary to the prob statement. Actually what would be great is to dial back for those of us who are convinced about whether or not movements are prioritising digital security. Think about the version of you as an individual prior to you being convinced. Because those are what the reasons are — you will find the causes there, beyond the big picture. - On the top is the impact — what happens as a result of our movements not prioritising digital security. What happens to our movement? - Think about it from the individual; if you're a trainer, how does that affect you? If you're someone who wants to make sure that your movements are prioritising it, then what does it mean that they don't? - Start from the individual before you go to collective/organisational, before you go to

		movement. Once you get to movement level, it's a project proposal.
		Latin America / Caribbean: For me it's more like what are they prioritising and how do they connect their priorities to digital security. Is digital security a tool to get better results for their priorities?
		Jenny: I think digital security is a tool. That language makes my hair stand up but I understand what you're saying.
		Latin America / Caribbean: I find it interesting as you're asking us as people who may or may not train to put ourselves as individuals first. Would you also ask us to think about other individuals? Or is that not our role?
		Cheekay: The tendency of feminists from my perspective is to put themselves last in an analysis. I can understand this can be uncomfortable for some people, not used to thinking about it from our perspective. We have a safe space here to talk about it from our perspective, as people who are (in various ways) champions in our feminist or other movements, on security. That perspective is also valid. Think about movements from that perspective, so we're not having an analysis that's up in the air but on a very embodied level. But again if you feel like you're veering that way, that's also fine.
		Participants are asked to split into 3 groups and to please document their process.
		Post-discussion debrief
		The worksheets/documentation of the three groups is recorded in the appendix.
		Cheekay asks participants to share highlights of the discussions before breaking for lunch.
		Participants comments are recorded in the report.
		Cheekay announces that after lunch they will discuss causes and impacts, gaps, and strategies yet to be implemented.
Day 3 (Oct 5)	S18: [Deepening Stream] Questions on Movement Building Aspects	**Facilitator: Jac** **Jac** explains that tomorrow there will not be a plenary, participants start the day in their streams. Participants are asked to hold discussions in small groups of 2 to 5 and to come up with a blueprint which they will outline in the first hour and a half on Day 4. **Jac:** Pull similar questions together and put questions down tonight if you think your questions stand alone. Put your name next to the question and ask for a host. If you see a question and have ideas, volunteer to be a host.

		Clusters of questions identified: ● Operationalising the feminist principles of the internet ● Engage with policy and governance ● Technical is political – how do we engage more feminist movements with technology? ● Bridging offline and online (issues of access, communities) ● Creating media/collaborative media ● Impact (methodology/tools/metrics) ● Opposition (learning from the opposition in order to disrupt) ● A few standalone questions Agenda for the following morning (Day 4) is that participants will see buckets, questions, standalones and decide/choose one to put their name next to. There will be a template to be filled in and this is how the streaming together will also work as everything participants document will give the other stream an idea of what they have done. **Jac:** Thank you so much for today's hard work and being with the process.

Day 3 (Oct 5)	S19: [Hacking Stream] Mapping Strategies	**Facilitators: Jenny and Sandra (Cheekay resting due to illness)**
		
		Introduction of agenda
		
		Jenny: We can create our own rhythm today, we can take a break when we need to. What we have planned is to walk our talk.
		
		● **Sandra** is going to lead us in some self-care practices
		● Then we'll sit for ourselves and write for 10 – 15 minutes what has come out in the time together, spark creativity and energy. For centering ourselves since there's been so much noise
		● When we've done that we can go into the questions and the group work
		  ○ How do we address the causes that we've identified?
		  ○ What are the strategies that we have, and
		  ○ What are the strategies we want to deepen tomorrow?
		
		Participants agree to this agenda format. For 15 minutes, the participants take time to journal and write. After that time, participants gather, and **Sandra** leads them in a body work and self-care exercise.
		
		Self-care exercise
		
		Instructions for the exercise are recorded in the report.
		
		Mapping Session Begins

Jenny explains that they will be mapping the work they are already doing — the current projects, approaches, strategies that they currently have.

Jenny: Mapping of the existing universe would be very useful to see, if we're wanting to move forward together, just to have a knowledge of what those activities are. Then to map that against if we feel that it is addressing enough of what we have identified, because I think a lot of us are in different silos and spaces, we have different knowledges. There's this thing happening out there where it feels like what we do is a bandaid, and it pops open, then we try something else, and it pops open, and we don't know if someone else has an amazing medicine for us to maybe heal.

The second step following that is how to improve what they're already doing — identifying missing strategies, mapping of the ecosystem and what people are doing, what gaps, are they addressing the problems, what are the good strategies, what else can they do, how can they work together?

Jenny: Then we'll wrap up for the day. Tomorrow we'll go deeper into the strategies that are the ones that we feel we should be doing and take that into the bigger group and hopefully get lots of money and save the world. Smash patriarchy! With a strategy not a tool!

Participants are asked their thoughts on how best to have the discussion — in three groups or in plenary.

MENA: Isn't there a small group who can tell us about their digital security projects?

Jenny: I think we're all (in this room) doing something, and I think it's really important that everyone speaks to that.

Latin America / Caribbean: If this is strategy thinking, we can separate into working groups of people that are already doing training — we can deepen how we can improve it. And then a group who want to have training, to discuss what questions they have for trainers.

Jenny: That makes sense but not for this mapping, we can do that for later. Let's go into groups, map what we're doing for 30 minutes, then we come back and think of a second methodology. Take a sheet of paper and map how you feel it should happen.

Participants get into three groups at random to map out existing strategies and activities for 30 minutes before coming back together.

<u>Mapping sharing</u>

Jenny: Let's share back and capture areas of where we have strategies, so we can identify gaps and look at strategies we

can choose to deepen together. That may be a useful way to look back as well. Can I have help with thinking of categories, so we can co-create?

Participants are invited to volunteer input. There is a lull while facilitators and participants figure out how to continue the session.

Jenny: Let's share for the last 20 minutes and tomorrow morning we can choose which areas to go deeper into, where we share feedback and cluster our strategies.

Group 1 presents highlights from their discussion. Group 2 and 3 do not present but instead one group is moved to the following day and participants discuss points on the worksheet of the remaining group generally, in a small plenary. The three groups' worksheets are placed in the center of the discussion circle, for participants to read and refer to.

The worksheets are recorded in the appendix.

Jenny informs the participants that they will cluster things into strategy areas based on the discussion and what's documented on the worksheets. There are currently five categories on the sheet and participants are invited to offer new ones if they are missing

Participants discuss and debate the terminology for certain categories before settling on a final list.

Latin America / Caribbean: If we've run out of time maybe we can make sense of it tomorrow to stay on time and then decide which are areas we can collaboratively develop or where the gaps are.

West Europe: There is somehow for me a link between the training need and infrastructure. Attacks are happening in that space, so maybe we need a safe infrastructure. That's linked to the support network but maybe it's something else, maybe that's infrastructure? There are also different type of responses, not only tech, there's legal response, etc.

Jenny: So should the term be "response"? Okay, response.

Latin America / Caribbean: Will approach include documentation?

Jenny: The approach is what we unpacked yesterday, from our discussion about feminist approach. If we want to aggregate a collective understanding of how we conduct digital security from a feminist perspective, that approach can be useful. Let's spend 30 minutes of this in the morning to wrap this discussion up and then identify categories. We'll clarify how much time we have tomorrow. Right now we've got time to do one more (worksheet).

		Participants share final comments on what they found interesting from their discussions, or from points raised by other groups, before wrapping up. Final list of categories: 1. Documentation 2. Approach 3. Constituencies 4. Support Networks 5. Research 6. Evaluation Impact 7. Infrastructure 8. Responses 9. Training
Day 3 (Oct 5)	S20: Streams Recap and End of Day Closing	**Facilitator: Bob** Someone from each stream recaps the discussion they had within their streams. <u>Hacking</u> **Jenny:** What we learned today was we took a look at the work that we're doing around digital security, very broadly, because we wanted to get a mapping of what is happening within our movements. We did that in smaller groups and we had a really interesting discussion within groups. We're mapping out the different areas. For example, what approaches are we using, what's fun, creative, based in the community, who's documenting what, what resources do we have? Anyone else from the stream want to help me out here? South Asia 1: So we had already defined our problem statement yesterday which was, "Why are feminist movements not prioritising digital security?" Today we started breaking down the causes that lead to that situation and the impact that this had on our movement and activism. We came up with — how digital security is viewed as paternalistic, where resources are lacking, to how digital security is not as inclusive as our movements, which is an ethical dilemma. We looked at this entire spectrum to see why digital security isn't always a priority. Then we discussed the impacts this have. For the next session, we focused on what we're already doing, the strategies we already have and the things we have already created and are working on, and tried to relate it to the causes we uncovered. We thought of ways we could overcome those barriers. We narrowed it down to clusters — like documentation, approaches. An approach is an attitude that you have for regular digital security training to make it fun, like beginning by focusing on what we already do know instead of focusing on what we don't know. Because people bring a lot of their experiences to the table that we've already developed over the course of a lifetime as an activist, so instead of thinking they don't know anything, start with that.

And also we discussed different types of documentation like producing research that helps contextualise the problem for feminists and people we're trying to talk to as feminists, and creates networks that drive a cultural shift that drives towards making digital security a priority.

Bob: I like how focused your stream is. Our stream was not singularly focused. We streamed this stream. We hacked this stream and we streamed the stream. How did we stream this stream?

<u>Deepening</u>

South Asia 2: We started with actually looking at the whole history of the internet and the digital revolution, establishing the timeline of what happened when and getting a historical picture. And then based on yesterday's discussion, **Jac** developed this kind of spider diagram mashup of all the key issues that came up yesterday and clustered them as issues around discourse and expression around leadership and accountability of these movements, who's the constituency, who's included/excluded, infrastructure and governance, related issues, who controls these technologies that we use, ways of organising both online and on ground, how do we look at impact and safety, threat, and risk.

We self-selected into these clusters and we were asked to look at three questions: 1) What new insights did we get from all this detailed discussion we did yesterday? 2) What were some key insights and 3) possibilities we saw emerging? We discussed those three and then we were asked to look at concrete strategies — where do we go from here? What are the sort of burning issues we want to work on and some strategies that we want to work on.

What happened as a result of that — and this is purely my subjective understanding so please correct me comrades — is when the groups were reporting back it was quite a stressful experience because **Jac** is like this monster timekeeper so each group got 2-3 minutes.

Each group came back with clear maps and we laid them out here and presented them to everyone else in this horrific 2 minute run.

What emerged here as a result is actually the makings of a feminist internet movement building manifesto. I can almost see that transforming into a manifesto that we all need to use to start our movement building especially when we are using online means for mobilising online.

And then they didn't know what to do next. They couldn't even decide whether to give us a coffee break or not. And then during the coffee break, **Jac** and someone else plotted and kind of tyrannised the process of deciding what we have to do now and tomorrow. They have given us new timelines.

And lots of emotional blackmail. We were even told what to eat. And to stay alert for tomorrow.

Bob: That was a very literal translation of what happened.

South Asia 2: They were being very right wing and effective!

Bob asks if anyone has any questions for the stream they weren't a part of, and there were none. **Jac** then clarifies the next day's agenda.

Agenda summary for Day 4

Jac: Today was strategise — so hopefully we did that today. Tomorrow in the morning we start off in our individual streams. So we have more time to do whatever needs to be done from 9 to 11am, when you're in the streams. And then the theory is from 11.30am – 12.30pm, we will come together to have a look at whatever the outputs of each stream are. For each stream that has been sort of asked to document particular things, each stream has gone its own way a little bit. The agenda was a little bit open.

The output of tomorrow's streams are also things we wanna take forward and do, it will be a moment for you to say "This is what I want to do."

We'll come back at 1.30pm instead of 2pm because we want to finish at 4pm. We envision that closing will take an hour. So we have 1.30 to 3 for us to actually do:

- Some personal commitments
- Whether or not we want collective commitment
- A little bit of an open bucket thing

That's to make it clear to you where we want to end up at 11 am tomorrow.

Bob asks if announcements can be done before self care so that the day ends with a self care session, participants agree.

Erika announces the activities for the evening, and where they will be happening:

- Karaoke at the hotel's karaoke room, booked until midnight
- Movie screening (feminist conversation – exploring politics, leadership and sex)
- A session on cyberfeminist (for political reasons) propaganda, where they're going to work on feminist stickers. Latin America / Caribbean: "If you don't have talent it's better, because its work around our feminist ideas and I can propose the subject — 'The Internet saved my life' — and we can work on stickers.
- A make your own zine workshop partnering with the Telegram stickers workshop

		- A session on encryption - A talk about feminist servers <hr>Participants left four pieces of feedback on the wall. They were mainly concerned about not having enough time for developing clear methodologies by the last day, clear instructions, and the sense of uncertainty in direction from an agenda that was too open. *Full feedback is recorded in the appendix.*
Day 3 (Oct 5)	S21: Self-care Session	**Facilitator: Sandra** This was the last session of Day 3. The exercise was done in pairs, with each person taking turns to carry out the instructions. *Instructions for the exercise are recorded in the report.*
Day 4 (Oct 6)	S22: [Deepening Stream] Clusters Deep Dive	**Facilitator: Jac** **Jac** uses yesterday's post-its to assign new clusters. Participants choose which clusters to discuss and split into groups in order to discuss them. Each team has a volunteer host to facilitate the conversation; some clusters don't have volunteers and are therefore not discussed. These are marked as inactive below. Group discussion breakdown - How can our internet use, approach and practices help sustain our movements in times of abeyances? - How to translate the feminist principles of the internet into practice to build stronger movements? [*Participants from Europe, Latin America and Caribbean, and South Asia*] - How to support and strengthen counter narratives to visibilise and viralise feminist discourse? [*Participants from Europe, MENA, North America, Latin America and Caribbean, and Southeast Asia*] - Collaborative feminist media, especially for young feminists, what platforms, strategies, and safety? [*Participants from Central Asia and East Europe, Latin America and Caribbean and MENA*] - How do we break the binary between online and onground organising and networks to build stronger feminist movements? [*Participants from Central Asia and East Europe, Latin America and Caribbean, North America, South Asia, Southeast Africa, and Southeast Asia*] - How to ensure accountability in a diffused, decentralised, multi-sited in feminist movements in the current context? [*Participants from Latin America and Caribbean, South Asia, and Southeast Asia*] - How do we map the enemy and learn their strategies? [*Participants from Africa, East Asia, Latin America and*

Caribbean, MENA, South Asia, Southeast Asia and West Europe]

- Strategies for Building Alternative Feminist (Digital) Economies? *Inactive*
- How do we continue the work and thinking here, beyond this space and time? *Inactive*
- How do we define and measure impact in a digital age? *Inactive*
- How to influence internet governance policies, structures and processes to reflect feminist agendas and analysis? *Inactive*

A table of these questions and subquestions is recorded in the appendix.

After the discussion, hosts are asked to come forward and share what their groups discussed.

Jac then counts off the rest of the participants into groups of five (selected at random). Each of the groups went to a host each and hosts reported back to these small groups.

During sharing, the hosts aim to answer the questions:

- What do you want to do?
- Why will this help build a feminist internet?
- How will you do this?
- Who or what do you need to make this happen?
- When? Time frame.

The groups switch at least three times.

Key insights are recorded in the report.

Jac ends the activity by bringing people back into plenary for deepening stream before tea break. In the interest of taking back the pace, she asks for participants to take a deep breath and exhale.

Agenda outline

Jac: I think this sort of ends the little bit the journey of this stream, and hopefully this means we've managed to do some collective unpacking, questioning, figuring things out, and trying to figure out what we're going to do about it and what we have.

After this we will have a coffee break and come back together as a full group (river). We will river. And then in the afternoon is where we start to think— you know what, these are fantastic, and I want to sit with you and you and make some commitments. What is possible or not? Let's concretise it a bit further.

Participant from North America suggests that the worksheets be put up so everyone else can see them.

		Break for tea/coffee.
Day 4 (Oct 6)	S23: [Hacking Stream] Digital Security in Feminist Movements	**Facilitator: Cheekay, Jenny, and Sandra** **Cheekay** asks the group that couldn't report back the previous day (due to lack of time) if they can start off the session by recapping their discussion. <u>Clarifying Categories</u> **Cheekay:** For the rest of our time we will be prioritising a few of the strategies that have emerged from the group work yesterday. I assume it will be — where people's energies are, that's where they'll go. **Cheekay** asks for participant input on what certain categories of strategies mean. A back and forth of about 15 minutes ensues, and the most debated terms are recorded below. - Participants debate whether Documentation as a category should include building evidence, or if that's parked under research. They agree that it should include toolkits, manuals, processes, and methodologies but are unsure if it also includes disseminating that information. - Latin America / Caribbean: I think tools and tactics are not the same as documentation. If we are talking documentation, then it's adding tools and resources that already exist. Tools and tactics on their own are very different. It's talking about our feelings about tactics, the moods, the limitations that already exists but I don't know if that goes to "Research and Evidence Building". **Cheekay:** Let's just acknowledge that we come from two different places when we say "Documentation", like from the technology side, it's writing the code, the other side is like building evidence and documenting cases. I think this is the confusion we are grappling with. - Oceania: Research is very different from documenting and needs to be its own category. I would argue that we need to add dissemination. You can research and it sits in the computer and nobody reads it. "Research" should be separate from "Documentation" and I'm not sure about "Documentation" either. Like maybe "Knowledge" and you can have categories of documentation. - A suggestion from a participant from Latin America / Caribbean for the group working on the category to define it - For Constituencies, **Jenny** wants to acknowledge that working with different constituencies — like sex

workers, LGBT — means considering that they experience impact differently
- For Support Networks, North America/East Africa notes that it could include initiatives or groups that do work that are on the periphery — try to include side note partnerships, people who are not directly involved but play a role
  - Latin America / Caribbean 1 wonders if it could also include supportive spaces
  - Latin America / Caribbean 2 asks if follow up, follow through, accompaniment as a response part of support networks. West Europe says yes because support network is not an initiative or organisation.
- Central Asia/North America: I'm trying to process this. I'm totally fine with the categories, but also I'm trying to revisit the bigger question we're trying to answer. Are we looking at how to make our movements safer? Okay. And the question about approach methodology, it's really important to maybe throw out there that we need to think about what do we mean by feminist methodology. It's really a big question. I don't know if we wanna park it or actually bring it back.
  - **Cheekay:** When we get into our affinity groups, one of the questions will be what are the guiding principles in this work. The hope is that we will come up with feminist approaches. I think that should be surfaced as a question when we're thinking through these strategies. We're not parking it and assuming that because we're a roomful of feminists that we will have a feminist approach.
  - **Sandra:** It's a fair assumption (laughter)
- **Cheekay** states that Evaluation/Impact is clear but boring and participants disagree.
  - Oceania: No, it's not! It's a circle — if you don't evaluate how do you know what's working and what to do better?
  - West Europe does not think it should be a separate category, but that it should be mainstreamed and fronted in all the categories
  - Latin America / Caribbean: I would add that Evaluation/Impact needs to be separate, but maybe the focus should be orientated towards tactics and strategy. How do we do our evaluations of impact in ways that can be useful. Are there projects that have come before the other thing that we did? We're connected to other ideas – we see evaluation and impact in different ways and what are the ways we can write it down?
  - Central Asia and East Europe suggests parking it with research and evidence building because they are related.
  - **Cheekay:** There are three suggestions I'm hearing: 1) It's a separate strategy 2)

Mainstream it across other strategies 3) Put it under Research and Evidence Building.
- ○ Oceania: With my experience with monitoring and evaluation — yes, it applies to all but it needs to sit on its own because if not it gets lost. When you mainstream anything it gets lost. We need to identify it as an important strategy on its own. They all interlink all together.
- North America/East Africa: I would make a case to put "Infrastructure" under "Support Networks". You need it but it's not a prominent thing, it's like a supporting role.
  - ○ **Jenny:** I think there's something around infrastructure that needs to be on its own, like an alternative response to what exists — we need an alternative to patriarchal heteronormative infrastructure. It's quite a radical response if we say that's what we want to do — like the spectrum, etc — we want to follow this as an output, very clearly
  - ○ Central Asia and East Europe: We talked yesterday about how do we move from the responsive to the active? And infrastructure is a way for that.
  - ○ Oceania: And it's a political act.
- Central Asia/North America: Where does holistic approach come in, so we're not hyper technical? Not to get into the issue of offline and online, it's just an ongoing dichotomy between the two, I don't know where it goes, I just want to encourage us to keep thinking.
  - ○ West Europe: Maybe every group can think of what relates to the digital and what relates to the physical.

Discussion Questions

Cheekay checks with participants that the categories are clearer now. Before breaking into groups she suggests the following questions:

- What are the components (and define that as you will) of this strategy?
- I want to go back to the analysis that we did. How does this address the root causes and impacts in our analysis? Make that clear. Speak to the evaluation and impact question. In answering that question, we're making outcome statements.
- Checking to make sure that this strategy has a holistic approach. How can this strategy have a holistic approach?
- What feminist principles should guide this strategy? So we're not assuming things and checking. And by that I mean approach, not the Feminist Principles of the Internet.

West Europe: And if they're missing, we put it no?

Jenny: It's like dreaming.

Cheekay: Is anyone interested in training?

West Europe: Are we going to jump from groups into another?

Cheekay: No, because we don't have time.

Latin America / Caribbean: Would you put people to different issues? Cluster them?

Participants have a discussion about jumping around between category discussion groups. Participant from West Europe would like the analysis to be more rich, and thinks jumping around would facilitate this. **Cheekay** worries there's no time.

In the end, **Cheekay** states that participants will split into groups to discuss the category they feel drawn to, and then they'll come back to present to the rest of the participants. This presentation will also be space for discussion by participants not in the category group.

Final Categories for Discussion

- Evaluation and Impact
- Infrastructure
- Training
- Research and Evidence Building
- Tactics and Toolkits
- Documentation
- Support Network and Spaces

Cheekay: You have 30 minutes to get through this as much you can — it doesn't have to be perfect. Each group will try to answer these questions, we'll come together, each group takes a station and we'll have simultaneous conversations happening.

Group Presentations

Participants are asked to find wall space to stick up their worksheets. Participants go around to listen to each group present what they discussed about their chosen cate Each group is given 3 minutes to present, with an additional 3 minutes for further questions and comments from other participants.

Discussions are recorded in the report. Worksheets are recorded in the appendix. Below are specific comments by participants on the discussion process

Research and Evidence Building

Oceania: We were looking at what kind of research and evidence building do we want to do? We started to think from that perspective, this here is a short list. Of our priorities because research – there's a lot of stuff.

Infrastructure

North America/East Africa: We were very organic in how we answered all the questions, we didn't do it in a linear way, thought dumping. We made a case that there's work that needs to be transversal across this whole group — everyone here, upstairs (in the deepening narrative stream), in the movement, in our networks — the work is shared by all and we can have commitments from all into moving this forward. The discussion was high level thinking but it was useful and productive, about how all of us see ourselves and locate ourselves in relation to infrastructure.

Support Networks, Partnerships, and Spaces

Central Asia and East Europe: In our group it was very interesting — we spent a lot of time on how we understood the topic. We finally decided to divide it in two parts: trainers and those who have access to knowledge (not just training but knowledge relevant to digital security) then the trainees. Later on, we discussed what are the specific needs based on personal experiences.

Tools and Tactics

Latin America / Caribbean 1: It was a broad topic to talk about so we had to choose an example to explain our ideas and we chose the example of online gender based violence. We tried to understand what's the specific context that triggers the need of using tools and tactics.

Southeast Asia: We were struggling in the beginning, trying to understand what "tools and tactics" means and response to WHAT? It will be different depending on what we are responding to. Depending on what stage it's at, whether it's an emergency or not. We used the example of online violence, so that's why we didn't come up with specific tools and tactics. We believe as feminists we need to be more proactive, to have proactive responses instead of reactive — we need to be ready, and to be building the sense of situations and the logic in how we come up with tools and tactics.

Sharing Methodologies & Documentation

West Europe: Our notes are a total mess. We started with how it takes a lot of time and resources to produce documentation.

Training

South Asia 1: A few strategies we used when we discussed why the training is important was to give case studies from

		India, not something we are talking about in the theoretical, but people that we actually know.

South Asia 2: There are components of training strategy that strategies that we already have which focuses on giving people hands-on experiences after they've been introduced to a concept.

Cheekay: Thank you to everyone for ending our stream and joining the pool. **Jenny** and I will do the report back (in the next session), and feel free to come in whenever you're done with tea break. |
| Day 4 (Oct 6) | S24: Streams Recap & Feminist Principles of the Internet | **Facilitator: Jac**

Jac does a short check in on how the participants are feeling and how their experience was in their stream.

She explains the "rivering" process – the facilitators from each stream will present a big picture of what happened in their streams, and then participants from both streams will "river" amongst themselves — "the chaos of the sea".

Participants have also been given stickers to wear — blue for hacking stream and green for deepening narrative stream.

Hacking

Jenny asks the hacking stream participants to identify themselves to the rest of the room, to help with rivering.

Cheekay: We started by unravelling the agenda for the stream. After we negotiated an agenda, we then moved into defining and then refining some terms, such as feminist approach, digital security, risk management, sustainability, resilience, online violence and hacking/to be hacked. Not to reach a consensus on definitions but to start exploring where each of us are coming from. And then we did an analysis of why are our feminist movements not prioritising digital security. We created trees with post-its of roots and consequences.

Jenny: And then we went into the strategising. We did an excellent exercise of mapping the existing strategies, which showed us where the gaps are. Then we clustered the existing strategies, and then named the broad areas of where the strategies fit in. It was a difficult exercise because there are so many cross cuts. What was interesting is, often a response to digital insecurity is training and capacity building whereas this showed us there was a huge range of responses and strategies we can employ. What we looked at was training, tools tactics and responses, infrastructure, evidence building and research, evaluating impact, support networks and sharing of methodologies. And then we gave four framing questions and looked at two crosscuts — holistic and feminist approach. There was another cluster, approaches, which we felt was not a group in and of itself. And then we've made |

plans which was looking at where people's energies were and looked at the deepening of these clusters so we can have tangible output.

Deepening

Vale: Deepening track was a very turbulent stream. We started also from locating ourselves, trying to map ourselves where we were where we come from. It unravelled a bit but it was because we could not see where we were going, having the river with so much grass and tree along the banks that you cannot see the next turn. So we did what we were supposed to do, which was to put the movement together with the digital. We defined seven clusters that were critical for us.

We deepened these clusters with a lot of questions and analysis. We moved from collective to individual questions — what was still unsaid, untold, missing, bothering us. Then we opened up the stream. Then it was a time of going deep again, reconciling again with the seven clusters from which we came.

What we did, we went back to the question and worked back and forth within clusters to triangulate. We came out with ideas and a clear timeframe. What, when, how, where, and why. From these eleven ideas the group prioritised six. And then we had a round and we came back to ourselves with a plan that can be a plan of operating from tomorrow but also a larger plan. We finally had our peak closer to the end, that we have something specific enough but also general enough to cover all the clusters that we have identified as critical. And now we can go back to the river.

Jan: I've got nothing more to add about the river. This moment was a moment of unravelling where we began to see each other. Before that, we were wondering if we were even in the same place speaking the same language.

Feminist principles of the internet

Jac introduces the FPI to participants.

Jac: You may have questions around the specificities and the details around what we have discussed. Some of these are really exciting, mapping the enemy and how to use that. Feminist media, how do we do that, translating principles into practice, and developing mechanisms of accountability within diverse movements with multiple sites of power. I just wanted to locate these streams into a larger river. We might overuse this bloody metaphor but I will carry on for now.

Feminist principles of the internet — we've been talking about it off and on, some of you may know it or not know it or know a little or know a lot. It's a conversation of different people (and some same people in this room), of activists working in women's rights, media, GBV, digi sec, coming

together into a feminist framework. What is going on in the world and what are our issues? Why is internet issues such a strange language? Everyone brought deep discussions and experiential work and it became distilled into a set of principles. It's not an agenda or a guide but a set of feminist principles on how do we engage with the internet, and these are some of our priority issues. It was a global gathering, and it splintered into smaller deeper conversations, we came together again, splintering was needed again and led by activists here, and so on. These are a set of living principles and they will be reiterated based on emerging analysis and changes. This is not isolated or coming from nowhere, it won't be free floating. It's already part of the larger conversation and movement. We imagined before during the past two meetings. But now we are making.

FPI brochures are handed out to participants.

Jac: If you have the FPIs in front of you and read through it, do you see some of them connect to what you've been talking about? Access, free/open source, online violence, economy, anonymity (anonymity vs safety vs visibility — the tension of that), memory (memory as resistance), movement building. Pretty much almost all of it. Nice to see some of it has also been done but there can still be deepening. Everything is interrelated and interconnected. Let's unravel the movement building principles and let's all pause to look at the preamble.

Jac reads the FPI preamble.

Jac: We've spent three and a half days interrogating and unpacking some of these key principles in the context of our work towards building stronger and more resilient movements now. Thank you very much.

Participants applaud.

Rivering

Based on number of people in a group, there should be one participant from the hacking stream (blue sticker) to two participants from the deepening stream (green sticker) Participants are asked to team up in threes and share about the key lessons and key insights from their stream. Participants have a discussion for about 15 minutes before coming back to the larger room.

Jac: How was it? Did you have similar conversations, did you have new ideas? Just to say the conversation has only just begun. This is a moment, not a movement. It will continue, the conversation will carry on. We wanted to have an early break, 12.30pm to 1.30pm, so we can stop earlier than usual at 3pm. 1.30pm until 3pm, we're talking about personal commitments, commitments towards plotting.

Participants are grouped together for a photo before lunch.

Day 4 (Oct 6)	S25: Collective Commitments	**Facilitator: Jac** **Jac:** I've been hearing throughout the three days that people really want to talk to other people in their region, people who's close to them who can share context and what is happening. Does that make sense to you? Shall we do that and break into regions? Then discuss any ideas you want to bring forward, spaces and opportunities to continue what has started here. Participants are asked who would like to be a focal person for their regional groups. The participants break into the following groups, and asked to find their own place to discuss for 45 minutes before coming back together. Region groups 1. South Caucuses, Eastern Europe, (final) Post-Soviet context 2. Oceania 3. Southeast Asia and East Asia 4. Latin America 5. South Asia 6. MENA 7. Sub-Saharan Africa 8. Western Europe + North America Participants write down their plans on worksheets. There is no time to report back and share, but the commitments will be shared with the participants after the meeting. *The worksheets are recorded in the appendix.*
Day 4 (Oct 6)	S26: Meeting Closing	**Facilitators: Aimee and Jac** Housekeeping and evaluations **Jac** discusses how information from the meeting will be shared and passed on to the participants and how communication will continue beyond the meeting ● Wiki ○ There's uncertainty about the fate about the wiki at http://wiki.feministinternet.org and how everyone will access it — whether everyone shares one username and password to start with or usernames and passwords are assigned to people to maintain security. Other safety concerns: will the documentation remain online, or will it be removed? If so, how will people access the resources (downloading straight from the wiki within a timeframe before deletion), and who will be responsible for scrubbing the notes? ● Website

○ Another place where the principles come alive is the website http://feministinternet.org. It's dynamic space for resources and stories, where the principles can come alive and it's in progress of being built. A participant from Latin America / Caribbean has idea to interlink the wiki to the website and **Jenny** and **Mallory** will try to make that real.

- Mailing List
  ○ The other piece of communication space is the mailing list we are all a part of. It's not going to be an events mailing list, it was meant to be for anyone interested in this conversation. Right now, it's all of us. We start it here and then we open it up. And there's specific criteria to who we open it up to, which are that you know them and work with them — additions have to be vouched for by someone on the list. We have 30 people from our existing network and who were at the first two Imagine a Feminist Internet meetings who have indicated interest. Then maybe we can facilitate an introduction to try and build trust and create a sense of trust.

- GenderIT.org
  ○ I think we will be doing various things from this event, in terms of stories from people we've spoken to, we'll be Storifying stories from the hashtag, a tweetchat will be taking place two weeks now. We'll also be pulling together content — the postcards, materials from the sticker events, a bunch of visuals and words coming from you. And if any of you have a burning story idea please contact **Namita**.

- Museum of Movements
  ○ **Jac:** One of the projects that I work on here is the Malaysia Design Archive, which is a digital archive that looks at design as artefacts that help unpack history and race relations etc. We've been active since 2008 and part of that is we have collections — we just started an LGBT collection in Malaysia — and we want to archive this as part of the collection. The question is, is this okay? Would you be okay with it as part of the activity, and if so, is there anything you want to take home so I can take a picture now and make sure it's part of the archive? Now we have a physical archive space as well and there are a lot of digital archivists who love to check things out and it'd be good to have our piece of history in that space. But if you have problems with it just come to me after.

		Evaluation forms are distributed for participants to fill out.
		Aimee: Specific feedback is best and feedback is what always makes us better. Tell us why this is great, what you are bringing back, etc.
		<u>Closing and gratitude</u>
		For the closing gratitude exercise, participants are asked to face in other in two rows and to affirm each other. The exercise is stopped after 5 minutes, and one row of participants is asked to move two spaces to the left and repeat the process another two times.
		Then participants are asked to get into one big circle, and to go around the room (**Aimee** states it's important to close with hearing everyone's voices in the space) to state their name, region, one action word, and one feeling word.
		These words have been rendered in word clouds which are recorded in the appendix.
		Lastly, the mic is passed around to different members of the organising team so they can thank everyone who helped put the meeting together.