Submission on Roadmap for IG evolution by the Articulation of Brazilian Civil Society Organizations

- Area: ROADMAP FOR THE FURTHER EVOLUTION OF THE INTERNET GOVERNANCE ECOSYSTEM
- Entitled by: Joana Varon Ferraz
- Region: Brazil
- Organization: Articulao de Organizaes da Sociedade Civil Brasileira
- Sector: Civil Society
- Keywords: Human rights, Multistakeholder Decision Making, Coordination Mechanism, Transparence, Accountability and Enforcement
- Doc Attached: Click here to see the doc 1

Abstract

The undersigned Brazilian civil society organizations propose the following concepts to be taken into account while developing a roadmap for the further evolution of the internet governance ecosystem: 1) Human Rights principles should be the core of IG and should be enforced globally 2) For enabling such protections, the development of IG institutional frameworks should also be guided by a set of procedural principles to be observed by governments and private organizations that play a role on the governance of all layers of the Internet 3) The current IG institutions should be reformed to address a set of both human rights and democratic procedural principles, but in order to maintain a transparent, democratic, multistakeholder, decentralized and coordinated IG ecosystem, we also highlight the need for: a) implementing a multistakeholder coordination mechanism to work as a "router", providing communication and coordination among IG institutions, and b) reforming and empowering the IGF.

Document

The undersigned Brazilian civil society organizations, committed to the development of the Internet and its use for advancing social and economic justice, propose that following concepts should be taken into account while developing a roadmap for the further evolution of the internet governance ecosystem:

General statement

Any evolution of the internet governance ecosystem should aim to foster institutional arrangements that respect:

1) Human rights principles. Human Rights principles should be the core of the Internet Governance ecosystem and should be enforced globally. The discussion of emerging problems, such as mass surveillance, and of the institutional mechanisms to cope with them should be guided by these principles (these were listed in our contribution for Section 1 of NetMundial). Nevertheless, there is need to develop institutional frameworks that help to ensure that human rights principles are observed.

2) Besides human rights principles, the development of these institutional frameworks should also be guided a set of procedural principles which contribute to building legitimate, participatory and effective governance arrangements. It is important that these principles are observed by governments and private organizations that play a role on the governance of all layers of the Internet.

- transparence;
- wide, open and diverse participation of all the stakeholders in decision making processes;
- effectiveness;
- accountability and
- enforcement.

Regarding the evolution of the current IG institutions

Internet Governance should be transparent, democratic, multilateral and multistakeholder, with the full envolvement of governments, civil society, the technical and academic communities and the business sector. It **should serve as a catalyst for development and for the promotion of human rights**.

Internet Governance institutional frameworks should be decentralized, aim to involve all stakeholders on decision-making, be adaptable and ensure that stakeholders with adequate expertise are called to address a particular set of problems. The outcomes of discussions should be effective and enforceable and be aligned with Human Rights principles. To strike such balance there is need for:

- An effective framework for Internet policy-making
- A transparent and accountable multistakeholder decision making process that promotes the participation of actors from developed and developing countries across all stakeholder groups.
- Decisions made should be efficient and enforceable. Depending on the nature and stage of the discussions, sometimes decisions should be embodied in multilateral agreements.
- In cases in which hard international law is not the best solution, soft law approaches, best practices, self-regulation and technical solutions might be considered, as they can sometimes be more efficient.
- The respect for fundamental human rights should be ensured.

There is **need for a mechanism to provide communication and coordination among IG institutions**. This mechanism should ensure that distribute governance does not lead to disjoint and fragmanted policy-making.

- A multistakeholder council* should assume such function, working as both an executive committee and a *router* to distribute tasks/emerging issues to be dealt by either the existing institutions or by an ad hoc mechanisms;
- Participants of the council should mirror the diversity of views in their own stakeholder group. Participation of actors from developed and developing countries should be ensured across all stakeholder groups.

- This mechanism should receive inputs from the IGF;

- This council could be hosted under the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD).The United NationsEconomic and Social Council (ECOSOC) became politically responsible to oversee the UN system-wide follow-up of WSIS and it does that through CSTD. According to Resolution 2006/46, CSTD should review and assess progress made in the implementation of WSIS outcomes and make advices. To do so, CSTD seeks inputs from international organizations, the private sector, civil society and other entities, therefore it has a established record of communicating with governmental and non-governmental organizations;

- A multistakeholder council created under CSTD should have the mandate to a) consult with other UN organizations or other institutions outside the UN system, such as technical institutions (ICANN, IETF, etc); b) in it's *router* function, make recommendations on issues to address and possible approaches to organizations within the UN system or to non-governmental organizations; c) take decisions which could take the form of soft law, identifying good practices, guidelines for self-regulation, etc; d) Send the outcomes of its discussions for appreciation in CSTD, if appropriate. These outcomes could be taken to ECOSOC and to the UNGA.

The Internet Governance Forum should be reformed and empowered and the quality of its outcomes should be improved. The IGF could work as a clearing house that feeds inputs into other existing internet governance spaces, and, eventually, to any mechanism to be created. Some proposals for IGF improvement were already indentified on the Report of the Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum, created under the auspices of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (**http://bit.ly/1dZvoDn).**
Some of this points were:

- The IGF should develop more tangible outputs, based on public policy related questions.

- The IGF should have a more propositive role for agenda setting in the international arena, being able to indicate politicy options identified by the multistakeholder community regarding a particular issue

- Stakeholders should foster transparency in their selection process to the MAG. The selection process should provide more diversity, especially regarding groups which have been underrepresented in the MAG.

- The secretariat should be strengthened

- Predictable, stable and neutral funding should be guaranteed

- The IGF should function in close cooperation with regional IGFs

Proposed by:

Article 19

Centro de Tecnologia e Sociedade - CTS/FGV

Coletivo Digital

Instituto Brasileiro de Defesa do Consumidor - IDEC

Instituto Intervozes

Instituto de Tecnologia e Sociedade - ITS

Knowledge Commons*

Movimento Mega

Partido Pirata do Brasil

GPOPAI

PROTESTE

ps. * Knowledge Commons presented a reservation regarding this paragraph.