**How do you understand existing governance arrangements - can you say briefly how you would describe how the internet is run at the moment**

Currently, guidelines issued by intergovernmental agencies such as the International Telecommunications Union(ITU) and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), private bodies such as as the Internet Corporation of Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), the Internet Society (ISOC), the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), the Internet Architecture Board (IAB),and the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA), occupy the space with increasing role of national governments. The libertarian ethos for individual freedom with which the internet started is pitted against the questions of national sovereignty, and US-sponsored self-regulation (which has acquired a whole new meaning), is paving a way for some forms of multistakeholder international regulation.

12/12/2013 9:18 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2973374374)

Disaggregated. Some parts are controlled entirely by governments, so China and Germany are each able to block the different kinds of context that they see as improper. Some parts like the domain name system are managed by the ICANN (with its attendant debates on whether it is truly multi stakeholder or whether its US base means it is US-controlled). There is the IETF and its work on technical protocols. The ITU controls some part of the infrastructure but has not actually been allowed a role in the Internet yet. The IGF discusses, and develops valuable principles and practices, which can be adopted later by one of the entities creating harder law for the Internet (for example, papers written at or campaigns originated in the IGF can affect a national government's Internet related laws). Finally, the human rights and other principles emerging from the United Nations also apply to the Internet.

12/11/2013 4:53 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2970323126)

Governance Our ​​people are the source for problems. Indeed the rulers of our countries defend their interests.

12/11/2013 11:27 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969640701)

(I take it that the focus here is on global governance of the Internet, and not national, the nexus between the two of course being undeniable.) In the understanding of my organization, and a network of actors we work with, global governance of the Internet is done largely by 4 key actors – (1) commercial interests of a few monopolistic global companies, who largely set the architecture (as policy), with little worthwhile regulation of any kind, (2) the laws and policy priorities of the US government, where most of the companies mentioned above are based, and which has some key controls over the 'technical and logical infrastructure' of the Internet, (3) to a lesser degree rich country clubs like OECD develop policy framework that too determine the emerging shape of the Internet, and (4) the basic technical and logical infrastructure of the Internet is run through a very innovative distributed technical governance systems, which has largely done its work well, but needs a better interface with global public policy principles.

12/11/2013 10:36 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969579494)

There is no universally agreed definition of “Internet Governance”. Traditionally, this referred to the way in which the Internet was run from a technical perspective, in particular the administration of the domain name system (DNS) by ICANN as well as the adoption of technical standards by a number of international tech bodies, like the IETF. This largely followed a multi-stakeholder model, at least in the sense that technical standards were not prescribed by government or inter-governmental bodies (IGOs) like the International Telecommunications Union (ITU). At the same time, even the technical organisations were not entirely removed from policy-making, in particular as regards free expression and intellectual property (trademarks), when administering the DNS. These days, Internet Governance also encompasses broader policy discussions. These discussions cover content regulation, cybercrime, telecommunications policy, e-commerce, intellectual property, intermediary liability, surveillance. The discussions take place both at the domestic and international level. Among the relevant IGOs in this space are the UN human rights bodies, which traditionally were mostly concerned with content regulation (e.g. defamation, hate speech), UNESCO (media), the ITU (telecommunications, moving into cybercrime, DNS?), World Intellectual Property Organisations (WIPO), World Trade Organisation (WTO), Council of Europe (content regulation and cybercrime), UN Office on Drugs & Crime (crimes committed on the internet, e.g. terrorism, “piracy”). Some of those policy issues are sometimes negotiated on a bilateral basis first before being used as a blueprint for other bilateral or multilateral agreements (e.g. intellectual property). Most of the broad policy discussions are discussed at the IGF, which is essentially a forum allowing the exchange of ideas on cyber issues but does not have the power to issue policy recommendations.

12/11/2013 9:21 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969498995)

My understanding of existing governance arrangements is that the internet is run through a distributed ecosystem of institutions, with bodies like ICANN, the RIRs, and CERTs responsible for the day to day management of technical issues, and a range of institutions dealing with internet policy issues. The distinction between technical and policy issues is unfortunately not always back and white. Institutions involved in international internet policy vary in terms of their scope (both of issues and geographic coverage) and their inclusiveness. For example, the Internet Governance Forum, covers the full range of global internet related public policy issues in a highly inclusive environment, whereas the Council of Europe’s work is more limited in scope and inclusiveness. Other examples of bodies dealing with internet related public policy issues include the ITU, OAS, OECD, UNESCO, and WIPO among others. At the national level there are different arrangements for internet governance, ranging from inclusive approaches as adopted by Brazil and Kenya taking, to less inclusive ones.

12/10/2013 8:42 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2968526464)

According to contracts and technical protocols, policies made at ICANN, IETF, WWW, etc.

12/10/2013 4:39 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967926810)

A largely distributed management system that to varying degrees and dependent on the institution in question is open and bottom-up in its processes.

12/10/2013 3:53 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967804515)

“The internet belongs to no one, everyone can use it, and everyone can improve it. That also applies to its governance.”(1) (1) Association for Progressive Communications “Response from the Association for Progressive Communications to the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation Questionnaire, 10 September, 2013, p. 10. Our response to this Best Bits Survey draws significantly on our WGEC Questionnaire response.

12/10/2013 1:24 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967448792)

Internet governance is in a state of flux with the repeated argument b/w multilateralism and the west promoted multistakeholderism. With the Snowden revelations the west based model has come under the pump and has lost the morally high ground.

12/10/2013 10:52 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967229198)

All stakeholders have a role to play - for example governments through national and international law, the private sector through markets for online services, the technical community through the development and management of standards and Internet resources, and civil society by promoting the public interest in policy processes. All of these contribute to how the Internet is run.

12/5/2013 10:04 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2958324897)

I see the arrangements as being dispersed between three major axes – • The technical organisations who keep the internet going • National governments who legislate domestically on public policy issues • Treaty bodies such as WIPO, ITU who negotiate contested public policy issues that require international agreement Sitting between these is the IGF which is the forum for international public policy issues. I see this as a kind of international think tank generating ideas, providing opportunities for learning, and as a way for the community to meet and exchange perspectives. The internet has grown more rapidly than any other communication medium in history. Partly this is because it has rolled out on existing telecommunications infrastructure but also partly because it is open to what has become known as permissionless innovation. Unlike analogue broadcasting where spectrum was strictly allocated and “pirate” radios suppressed, anyone can add anything to the internet without requiring the regulators permission. Policy tends to follow events – it is “adaptive” and voluntary, rather than trying to anticipate events and be “predictive” and regulatory. Given the absence of planning, how has the internet stayed coherent and functional? It has done so because the technical organisations that run the internet develop standards in open forums, where they are discussed, tested, analysed and if they work they are adopted voluntary. While the broadcast world imposed spectrum regulation, the internet world voluntarily adopted standards that allowed the internet to work. And these forums were comprised of engineers, academics, civil society groups, companies – anyone who had a stake in the functioning of the internet – any stakeholder – could contribute. It is from this background, from my understanding, that the idea of multi-stakeholderism was born. Elsewhere multi-stakeholder bodies seem to be voluntary groupings that exist to enforce previously agreed standards eg the Kimberly process or the EITI.

12/4/2013 2:41 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2956201756)

A mix of largely tech community led agencies, private for profits, some government (mostly US) contracting out, -- multiple parties in loose and on-going collaboration

11/30/2013 1:16 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2948688252)

The Ugandan context is restricted and with coming in effect of the Computer Misuse Act 2012, the situation is set to worsen as government is bound to use to the law to stifle expression on line. But also political governance is deteriorating in Uganda and activists on line are being threatened and harassed.

11/29/2013 4:15 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2948131335)

My understanding is that on one part, there is the infrastructure management - run by consortia and governments. There is the names and numbers domain, run by ICANN and the Registries. There is the content "Lords" Yahoo, Google, Facebook etc. There are also the Technical standards group: The Human rights, users, activists and inclusion workers are also in. Though the WSIS Tunis agenda recognises Governments, private sector, Civil Society and Technical/Academia. Though there are different actors, influence is mainly with governments/regulators and ICANN.

11/29/2013 7:41 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947620486)

Basically its run through a multi stake holder framework that is not well balanced in terms of equity in decision making though it has the overall framework of multistakeholderism

11/28/2013 9:03 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947224478)

The definition of Internet Governance in the Tunis Agenda covers both Governance OF the Internet and governance ON the Internet (the evolution and use of the Internet). The first aspect, related to the logical layer of the Internet (standards, naming and addressing system), is managed by the ecosystem of organizations comprising IETF, W3C, root server operators, RIRs, registries, registrars, ICANN, etc... It has functioned so far in a way that is open, multi-stakeholder and allowed the system to scale up from a few thousand to more than 2,5 billion users. Improvements are always needed, in particular to foster inclusion, participation, transparency and accountability, but it is functional. The second dimension however (governance ON the Internet) does not have appropriate institutions, processes and structures to address in a multi-stakeholder manner important issues related to how people use the network, such as freedom of expression, privacy, fighting cybercrime, etc... The development of appropriate mechanisms involving all the different actors in issue-based governance networks is required, lest a proliferation of uncoordinated and potentially incompatible national laws make these issue even harder to address.

11/28/2013 6:58 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947112562)

largely by organisations set up by pioneers

11/27/2013 7:12 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2945627104)

**Q3**

**What is the case for reform of these arrangements and on what grounds (better protection of human rights and democracy, better representation from global south etc)**

Governance Issues: acknowledgment that the net belongs to the people who use it who are having a crisis of trust and not to the proponents of Multi-Lateral or Multi-Stakeholder systems. Developing countries' issues with emphasis on education & empowerment; Changing the dialogue around Freedom of Speech & Expression; Recognizing privacy including secrecy, anonymity and autonomy as inherent parts of democracy.

12/12/2013 9:18 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2973374374)

While it is difficult to get different countries on board with the same freedom of speech norms, currently even the very bare minimum norms that have been agreed upon by the world are not embedded in the Internet. Violation of the rights of free expression and privacy are rampant. Neither a state-centric, not a deregulated & market-oriented approach is going to help with this. The only way to make a stable, user-friendly Internet accessible without embedded hazards to people across the world, is to create a human rights framework for the Internet. Without this, even people who do not use the Internet but whose data is on it thanks to states and other service providers, will have their human rights endangered.

12/11/2013 4:53 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2970323126)

3. The causes are many and few felt reforms, human rights are violated. Poverty is rising and revenues increasingly rare. People cling to what they can do to survive from day to day.

12/11/2013 11:27 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969640701)

A few of them: 1. There is a huge public policy vacuum with regard to the global Internet, and the Internet seems to follow the very defective argument of free and unregulated market. It is held that private contracts are more or less enough as governance framework for this most important to global infrastructures. 2. Whatever public policy making systems do exist, they suffer from a huge democratic deficit. The default model of global public policy making (apart from US law and public policy priorities being exported globally through the 'architecture is policy' logic) is for rich countries to develop policy frameworks and then offer it to developing countries on a 'take it or be damned' basis. 3. Behind the veneer of technical-neutrality of the Internet, the fact is that the way the Internet is being shaped takes strongly from free market / neolib ideology of its time and place of birth (in the US, under Clinton administration). Such ideological/ political basis of the Internet needs to be made explicit and the socio-political basis of the Internet re-negotiated globally, on the basis of what can be considered as global public interest, with due regard to the perspectives and interests of billions of people unrepresented at present in shaping the political basis of the Internet. 4. The real egalitarian nature of what was supported to be a peer-to-peer technology, with controls at the peripheries, has to be reclaimed. People must reclaim the Internet from the dominant forces that control the Internet at present. This can only be done by developing true participatory democracy for global governance of the Internet, and appropriate institutions for this purpose .

12/11/2013 10:36 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969579494)

There seems to be two strands to this discussion: • One is reform of ICANN, which has been criticised for its lack of transparency, accountability and representation. In particular, ICANN has been resented by governments in the Global South to the extent that (i) governments only have an advisory role in the way in which the DNS is administered; (ii) in practice, because of ICANN’s historical and contractual ties with the US, the US government and US companies have been seen as exerting the greatest influence over ICANN. Whilst calls for reform of ICANN are not new, Brazil’s forceful reaction to the NSA scandal seemingly prompted ICANN CEO’s announcement that ICANN should break away from the US. • The second touches on the more global policy arrangements. The implications of this are unclear given the multiple fora in which policy is discussed. In light of Brazil’s recent statements and its own domestic Internet policy arrangements (including the CGI and the Marco Civil, not yet adopted), it seems that the broad idea would be to replicate those arrangements at the international level. A first step in this direction would be to strengthen the IGF and turn it into an IGF+ that would make recommendations on Internet policy issues. In addition, there is a broader question as to whether the NSA scandal warrants international action, in the form of multilateral, bilateral agreements or some multi-stakeholder response. A19 believes that there is a strong case for reform of ICANN for the reasons outlined above, in particular greater representation of the global south whilst at the same time making it clear that ICANN should not regulate content or be used as a vehicle for violations of FOE. It would be desirable for the IGF to have more teeth in order to have more consistency and a holistic approach to internet policy. In that sense, an IGF+ should be supported. At the same time, it is doubtful that an IGF+ would be able to adopt effective policy standards by consensus given the wide range and diversity of stakeholders’ views (see also Q5 below).

12/11/2013 9:21 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969498995)

The case for reforming these arrangements is to broaden the voices heard/represented in internet governance discussions so that internet policy better meets the needs of individuals around the world. A broader range of representation of all stakeholders, in particular from the global south, is needed as the current governance arrangements are not fully meeting the needs of much of the world’s population, in terms of access to the internet itself, but to the exercise of human rights online, Specific shortcomings include in the areas of access to content/information, knowledge, open software solutions, and the protection of the human rights to privacy online, expression, and association online. Inclusive, bottom up institutions tend to be better suited to bring in a diversity of voices, and facilitate an innovative and open internet.

12/10/2013 8:42 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2968526464)

Protection of human rights is not a priority at ICANN, which is a private corporation and as such claims it owes no duty to protect any human rights.

12/10/2013 4:39 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967926810)

The reasons for their reform should be based upon 1) the efficiency of the organization and the efficacy with which they undertake the task they are responsible for; 2) their representativeness and openness; 3) their willingness to evolve based upon the above and to objectively consider proposals for their evolution.

12/10/2013 3:53 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967804515)

APC believes that there has been no clear case made for reform of current internet governance arrangements, although all parts of these arrangement can continue to evolve, strengthen, innovate and develop. We are aware that the WGEC is currently conducting a mapping exercise to consider the range of internet related public policy issues and the various and widely diverse arrangements for dealing with them. The results of this mapping exercise (which should be available by February 2014) should inform inputs to the Brazil meeting. Internet governance arrangements should only be reformed where this will result in improvements and increase democratisation of the internet at all levels. This can only be done through multi-stakeholder processes where civil society are involved as an equal stakeholder with government, technical and academic, private sector and other stakeholders. APC’s view is that such multi-stakeholder participation is not an end in itself, it is a means to achieve the end of inclusive democratic internet governance that enables the internet to be a force, to quote from the Geneva Declaration, for “the attainment of a more peaceful, just and prosperous world.” (paragraph 2). Improving multi-stakeholder processes, and thereby, the outcomes of those processes, cannot take place by only looking at the role of governments. As noted in our submission to the WGEC Questionnaire: When the Tunis Agenda was developed in 2005, few governments had any involvement in the management of the internet: at global, regional or national level. Most agreed that the internet was important, and that governments should have a role. Many were not satisfied with existing 'internet governance arrangements' but could not reach consensus on how to proceed. Dissatisfaction centred on the fact that some internet governance bodies like ICANN and IANA were not fully internationalised, being located in the United States and, in some respects, accountable to the US government. While on the one hand internet management was distributed, power and influence of this management was concentrated in the 'global north'. Some member states also felt there were public policy issues without a clear home inside the existing international system. However, management of the internet has evolved since 2005. The IGF is an established process for internet policy dialogue and has a mandate to be more outcome-oriented from ECOSOC via the CSTD WG on IGF improvements. More countries address internet policy issues at national level. The ITU, UNESCO, UNCTAD and many other UN bodies address internet-related policy issues, such as the Human Rights Council which deals with human rights on the internet. Regional governmental bodies like the European Commission and the African Union Commission address a wide range of internet policy issues. There is clearly a vibrant and diverse internet governance ecosystem at work. But it cannot be said that all parts of it are adequately inclusive, transparent and accountable. Assessing the extent to which EC has taken place involves looking at participation, power and influence in both the ecosystem and its components. This is neither a trivial exercise, nor a once-off exercise. We support the recent Best Bits (2) submission to the WGEC that the scope of EC “should include the development of globally-applicable principles on public policy issues” (para 70) and “also could envisage creation of a suitable framework or mechanisms, where justified” (para 61), but does not envision the involvement of governments “in the day-to-day technical and operational matters, that do not impact on international public policy issues” (para 69). The purpose of enhancing cooperation is improving and democratising the governance of the internet, at all levels. Therefore its implementation is continuous and decentralised, and needs to be evaluated on an ongoing basis throughout the internet governance ecosystem. (2) Best Bits is a coalition of CS organisations that submitted a response to the CSTD WG questionnaire. APC has endorsed its response to the WGEC Questionnaire, which is available at <http://bestbits.net/ec/>

12/10/2013 1:24 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967448792)

Case is to involve more academicians from the global south through an open call in lieu of one member NGO's into a new model of governance. Idea is retire exclusivity and build a certain result based arrangement.

12/10/2013 10:52 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967229198)

There is little to no coordination of the arrangements described above. Since the actions taken by stakeholders are interdependent and their impacts can cross national borders, the result is that not all stakeholders who are impacted by Internet governance processes currently have a voice in those that effect them. So the case for reform to existing arrangements is to make them more globally democratic.

12/5/2013 10:04 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2958324897)

There are those who argue that the current arrangements are essentially undemocratic in that the greatest influence over the shape of the internet resides with the early adapters who established the initial standards – and specifically the US government which holds the ICANN contract. And through the dominance of US companies in the social media space the US is seen as exercising much de facto control over the internet, to the disadvantage in particular of the developing world/global south. From my point of view the rapid spread of the internet and its revolutionary power relative to other, nationally controlled media, is an argument for keeping the best part of the current system, the permissionless innovation and adaptive rule making. The development of the internet in the US meant that it benefited from 1st amendment protections but has proved vulnerable to privacy violations from the NSA and its allies, using the privileged position of the USG with US companies and the fact that in using US company services, traffic passes through the US where it is vulnerable to interception. The weakness is therefore both political/legal and technical. For me, the case for reform is: The technical organisations need to be independent of any government control if there are to be able to continue to develop the internet in the most open and accessible form. While laws will always be made at the national level, there is a need for a stronger normative frame for the internet that can build upon the framework set by Frank LaRue’s report to the Human Rights Council in 2011. This would then provide a human rights framework for dealing with public policy issues. While the logical and traditional approach would be to establish a state based body to provide that normative input, the downside is that the internet is now such a contested space between government and people throughout the world, that any state based body would become simply another forum for inter state geo-political competition and the internet would suffer. Hence I am interested in whether we can adapt the IGF into more of a standards setting body, developing human rights norms by consensus, and recommending them to the current structure of dispersed governance – the tech community, national governments and treaty bodies.

12/4/2013 2:41 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2956201756)

Not sure how much "reform" is needed in these arrangements directly but there is a need for some broader policy framework to respond to the range of technical and other policy related issues that are emerging extremely rapidly--which have tech and a policy component along a spectrum from highly technical (with minimum policy) to highly policy (with minimum tech)--such as surveillance/security, copyright,spam, porn, access, transfer pricing/taxation--and the list goes.

11/30/2013 1:16 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2948688252)

There's need for collective advocacy for condusive legislation to protection free expression on line and digital transformation. But also, collective awareness raising is required to prevent surveillance and repression of internet activists and users

11/29/2013 4:15 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2948131335)

Though ICANN has made some changes, there is still a lot to do over there. There is no consensus on protection of online freedom and the role of UN organisations like ITU are still not cleared. Then there is the mandate of the IGF, which is still non-decisional.

11/29/2013 7:41 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947620486)

More inclusive of civil society

11/28/2013 9:03 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947224478)

As indicated above, further efforts towards inclusion, participation, transparency and accountability can and should be undertaken in the existing ecosystem regarding the Governance OF the Internet. Another, parallel, area in that regard is the evolution of the mechanisms ensuring the integrity of the root zone file, including the validation role currently performed by the US NTIA. This is more a politically symbolic issue than a performance or technical problem, that can (and should) be addressed in a fact-based and cooperative manner, to ensure that no one, voluntarily or involuntarily can tamper with the root. The main case for developing new frameworks for the Governance ON the Internet is simple: there are no such frameworks yet and they are needed.

11/28/2013 6:58 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947112562)

unrepresentatve, major stakeholders such as government alienated from governance structures, primitive and often highly eccentric organisational structures that have in their current form outlived their usefulness

11/27/2013 7:12 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2945627104)

**What existing proposals for reform are you aware of and how do they meet the criteria for reform you set out in the previous question**

Structural reforms in ICANN; Brazil Summit which I am not sure is headed where;

12/12/2013 9:18 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2973374374)

I need to think about this more. However most proposals for reform seem to expect either a consistently multilateral or a consistently multi stakeholder approach. I think that the different parts of Internet Governance need consideration. There needs to be multilateral agreement, as well as a mechanism to bind international companies to the core human rights part of any reform. The procedural part needs to contain transparency and accountability, but also needs a structure that helps it be as responsive as is necessary for particular functions of governance.

12/11/2013 4:53 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2970323126)

One of the proposals is the equitable sharing of the wealth of the world and countries. Indeed the world is run by multinationals and countries by their servants. The interest remains the main criterion for politicians. Justice must be independent and commitment of governments to eradicate poverty by implementing a suitable and efficient education system, health for all, development of agriculture and animal husbandry and conservation units and processing of agricultural and forestry as well as the establishment of a network of credit unions and support for income generating activities products.

12/11/2013 11:27 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969640701)

Not many, really. But IBSA has been making the right noises, since its 2010 statement to the UNDESA consultations on enhanced cooperation, and later the individual positions of countries like India and Brazil. President of Brazil's recent statement to the UN General Assembly comes very close to the proposal made by India in 2011 to the UN General assembly for setting up a UN Committee on Internet Related Policies (especially since it seems that India has lately moved towards removing the 'oversight' function from the proposed CIRP and appears to agree that 'oversight' imperative may require a different treatment). South Africa's response to WGEC also appears not too far from these positions. IT for Change and about 40 other civil society organizations (plus many other individuals) made a concrete proposal to the WGEC which seeks two new bodies, (1) a UN Committee on the lines of the OCED's CICCP, and also India's CIRP proposal (minus the 'oversight' function), (2) a Technical Oversight and Advisory Board, to take up the 'oversight' functions currently unilaterally exercised by the US government

12/11/2013 10:36 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969579494)

Reform proposals in this space can be broadly divided into the following two models: (1) the traditional multilateral model, which is mainly state-driven; (2) the multi-stakeholder model in which all stakeholders have an equal say in international policy-making. For ICANN, this translates into roughly two main strands. - First, the internationalisation of ICANN although it is not entirely clear what this means and how this can be achieved. At a minimum, this includes efforts to make ICANN more independent from the US government. The Internet Governance Project has set out some detailed reform proposals for ICANN that should be carefully scrutinised. France has apparently suggested that ICANN should remain a not-for-profit organisation that would roughly look like the Brazilian CGI. ICANN would be relocated to another country. - Secondly, ICANN would be turned into an inter-governmental organisation or some of its functions would be transferred to another international organisation or ICANN would be made subject to oversight by another UN-body; the most obvious candidate here would be the ITU. As far as the IGF is concerned, there seems to be two competing views. One is the IGF+ (see above), the second – which seems largely theoretical at this point – would be to turn the IGF into a UN-type body, i.e. following a multilateral rather than multi-stakeholder model.

12/11/2013 9:21 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969498995)

Among the many proposals for reform, a few that stand out are India’s Committee for Internet Related Policy (CIRP) proposal, IT for Change’s proposal to the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, Wolfgang Kleinwächter’s Multistakeholder Internet Policy Council (MIPOC), Jeremy Malcolm’s Multistakeholder Internet Policy Council (MIPC), as well as a series of options to reform ICANN’s relationship with the U.S. government. My understanding of CIRP and the IT for Change proposals is that while they would put governments on more equal footing among each other, the intergovernmental approach that they promote would afford all other stakeholders, like civil society and the technical community, an advisory role, secondary to governments. They would therefore not meet the criteria listed in the previous question. Some proposals for reforming ICANN’s relationship with the U.S., such as transferring it’s responsibilities to the ITU (not currently a popular one, but worth mentioning) would also not meet the criteria laid out above, as the ITU is generally speaking less transparent, inclusive, and bottom up than many of the other institutions in the internet governance ecosystem. MIPOC, MIPC, and other efforts to reform and strengthen the IGF seem to meet the criteria laid out in the above question, assuming they are consistent with the spirit of openness and inclusiveness currently embodied by the Forum. But until more governments see the value in engaging at the IGF and at ICANN’s GAC, there will still be a push for intergovernmental bodies as demonstrated by the CIRP and IT for Change proposals.

12/10/2013 8:42 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2968526464)

None.

12/10/2013 4:39 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967926810)

Based on the criteria above, the existing mechanisms and structures should be looking at how they can evolve on an ongoing basis. I do not believe that there is a case for reform for reform's sake or that there is a case for remodeling the existing management system without very clear and compelling reasons to do so - again based on the criteria above.

12/10/2013 3:53 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967804515)

We are not aware of any proposals for reform that meet these criteria. Some argue that EC can only be achieved by establishing more centralised coordination and oversight of this ecosystem. We would argue the opposite. There has been a blossoming of mechanisms in which EC can take place since the Tunis Agenda was agreed (3). This includes both new and existing mechanisms. But importantly, it also includes mechanisms that are not 'internet-specific'. David Souter points out that the internet policy environment “includes diverse institutions from both mainstream public policy and internet governance contexts.” (Global Information Society Watch 2011 p 56). While this growing ecosystem risks being overly complex and opaque, it also increases depth, diversity, and the opportunity for participation. Any mechanism, regardless of its modalities or form, will be more effective in enhancing cooperation if those participating in it are able to participate with confidence. We believe an important component of the internet governance ecosystem is for different stakeholder groups to have their own spaces, to deliberate among one another. The extent to which the growing number of individuals, institutions, networks and communities that have a stake in internet policy have access to such spaces, varies. We would argue that the existing intergovernmental system, at global and regional level, provides governments with ample opportunity for such deliberation. The challenge is to give greater voice to developing country governments in such deliberation, and to develop a rights-based approach to internet policy. Building new formal mechanisms will only increase this challenge. CS is the most heterogeneous sector involved in internet governance and has the fewest resources. CSOs also have to overcome the challenge posed by the diversity of experiences and views in the sector; particularly difficult as they have few opportunities for effective deliberations among one another. Rather than create new policy-making or oversight mechanisms we recommend the following: i. Strengthening the meaningful participation of all stakeholders in existing mechanisms - particularly developing country stakeholders. There is a disturbing trend towards 'tokenistic' inclusion of non-governmental and developing country stakeholders in multi-stakeholder processes, represented by, for example, the ritual of all stakeholders and regions being 'represented' in opening and closing ceremonies; ii. CS engagement to be empowered within existing mechanisms at national, regional and global levels. CS's heterogeneity must be recognised as a strength and existing mechanisms must ensure that modalities for participation provide ample space for the diversity of voices in CS to be heard; iii. Existing mechanisms to commit to increasing transparency and accountability to the public-interest (and if this interest is not clear, to be willing to identify it in the context of their work); iv. Periodic evaluation of the extent to which such mechanisms actively demonstrate EC - with this to be understood as improved and democratised public-interest oriented governance; v. Existing mechanisms with power and resources such as ICANN to avoid mission creep. ICANN itself has become increasingly engaged in other internet governance issues. While this collaboration is positive, it risks blurring the clear demarcation between its narrow technical coordination role and other more substantive internet related public policy issues which it is not equipped or mandated to address; vi. Establishing information clearing houses and policy observatories such as the European Commission's proposed Global Internet Policy Observatory (4) and ensuring that these work in collaboration with the IGF process; vii. Capacity building initiatives. In some instances there might be a need for a new mechanism, for example, to address and prevent the rights violations that result from mass surveillance by governments, working with corporations. We would still recommend first exploring whether existing human rights mechanisms cannot play the needed role before opting for the creation of new mechanisms. (3) The Tunis Agenda identifies at least 16 UN agencies as appropriate for involvement in implementation or facilitation of the Geneva Plan of Action (see Annex to WSIS Outcome Documents, December 2005, p 96). Additional UN mechanisms that have focused on internet related public policy issues since the WSIS and in which nongovernmental organisations have had a role include the UN Human Rights Council; the Human Rights Committee (General Comment 34); Commission on the Status of Women and the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women. (4) <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/en/news/commission-plans-guide-through-global-internet-policy-labyrinth>

12/10/2013 1:24 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967448792)

ICANN is "supposed to become msm" but its success remains to be seen. And it has commenced engaging only based on faulty empirical foundations and is bound to fail

12/10/2013 10:52 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967229198)

There are proposals that cover only technical processes (such as internationalisation of ICANN), and those that cover other public policy issues (such as development of a set of universal Internet principles). I have proposed a specific mechanism, to be hosted at the IGF, that I believe could meet many of the requirements to fill the gap in existing governance

structures; a Multistakeholder Internet Policy Council.

12/5/2013 10:04 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2958324897)

There seem to be two broad strands. Radical reform by establishing a new inter state body e.g. Committee on Internet Related Policies as part of the UN machinery, and with the responsibility to consult business and civil society. This could include authority over the technical community with ICANN incorporated into its remit, or be a body that stands aside from the tech community and focuses on the Tunis Agenda. Reforming the existing dispersed mechanism while retaining their multi-stakeholder character. To the extent that bodes like the IGF seek to go beyond being the current talking shop, there are two possible directions. For the IGF to be more effective in discussing and shaping public policy issues (and then recommending them to other parts of the eco-system) we might need a new mechanism such as the proposed Multistakeholder Internet Policy Council (MIPOC)

12/4/2013 2:41 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2956201756)

There are a range--MSism, CIRP, the status quo...Whatever is done will need to have wide agreement among the various parties so it is hard to determined the successful approach in advance. Probably will need an incremental and iterative approach.

11/30/2013 1:16 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2948688252)

The campaigns surrounding reforms of national legislation that stifles Freedom of Expression and Information on line.

11/29/2013 4:15 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2948131335)

I'm aware of the ICANN internationalisation efforts, the Workinng Group on Enhanced Cooperation and the IGF, but I'm not sure they clearly attend to all the problems

11/29/2013 7:41 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947620486)

The Brazilian Initiative

11/28/2013 9:03 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947224478)

Internationalization of ICANN in terms of outreach/engagement is currently under way: creation of three hubs in Los Angeles, Istanbul and Singapore; engagement offices and strengthening of the regional VPs; participation in third-party events, etc... Internationalization of the IANA validation function is a different topic that needs its own process. The meeting now planned in Brazil will likely be an opportunity to open the discussion. But this will likely take time. As for the evolution of the IGF, it is important not to dramatically change its issue-framing nature and its role as the main "watering hole" for all actors involved in Internet Governance to gather each year and report on progress. It is however desirable that the IGF could serve as a better catalyst of and milestone-validating opportunity for issue-based initiatives on more operational issues.

11/28/2013 6:58 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947112562)

many voices, many discussions, no coherent direction

11/27/2013 7:12 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2945627104)

**Q5**

**What reforms would you support. E.G. Internationalising ICANN, Reforming IGF, developing a new treaty protecting human rights online etc. It would be useful if you could give details of the kinds of reform you would support**

A new treaty protecting Human Rights and online civil liberties; Reforming IGF (IGF as a forum has been a testing ground for enhanced cooperation. The IGF has created a platform enabling interaction between various stakeholder groups. However, there is a need for outcome documents from the IGF to feed into policy initiatives at various international and inter-governmental organisations. This would make IGF more meaningful as a forum that can influence policy dialogues in the international sphere.) Legal certainties on a variety of issues

12/12/2013 9:18 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2973374374)

See above. I think internationalising ICANN should certainly be discussed. It is not clear to me that reforming IGF is necessary, particularly because if the IGF becomes a site for direct policy impact, it may get taken over by interest-groups and may not be as friendly a space for dialogue anymore. I think that a treaty or an addendum to other human rights treaties affirming states' commitments to existing international human rights on the Internet is necessary. It would also help if this instrument comes with a reporting mechanism (ideally even a dispute resolution forum) for all the powerful stakeholders. I do however need to give this much more thought.

12/11/2013 4:53 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2970323126)

We support before any reforms on the improvement of living conditions and production of the poorest families. Strengthening the productivity of family explorations and exhaust flow and their production facilities.

12/11/2013 11:27 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969640701)

Establishing an global anchor organization to look into global Internet related public policy issues, in the sense of being able to actually develop such policies (instead of OCED's CICCP kind of bodies doing it for the world) and also support the required treaty processes as and when required, like possibly, of course, one on protecting human rights online. But as we go forward so many global policy issues connected to the use and misuse of the Internet will keep emerging, and many of these will require specific global agreements. We need not wait for crises – like the one triggered by Snowden's revelations – to come up with appropriate governance responses. A good governance system is one which is able to look forward, and prepare in advance. Internationalizing ICANN in the actual meaning of internationalizing it – whereby it is subject to no kind of executive, legislative or judicial control or oversight of any one particular country in terms of its substantive work. It should be subject only to international law and oversight of international institutions. I think IGF improvement is another track altogether. In any case, Indian government's proposal for IGF improvement submitted to the WG on IGF improvement is the most comprehensive IGF improvement proposal to date (a similar one was put forward by my organization, IT for Change). It does however appear quite odd that those who opposed that proposal less than 2 years back are now proposing similar things, but, interestingly, not in a discussion on the IGF (where they opposed them) but during a discussion on enhanced cooperation (which has clearly been marked by UN GA resolutions as a process distinct from but complementary to enhanced cooperation). This perhaps require an explanation.

12/11/2013 10:36 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969579494)

See above Q3. In principle, internationalising ICANN seems like a good proposal. However, it depends on how this process is understood. It seems like the focus should be more on ways in which greater representation and independence could be achieved through corporate governance rather than turning ICANN into an inter-governmental body, like the ITU for instance, that would significantly undermine the tech community’s independence and civil society’s contribution to Internet policy. Reforming the IGF to give it more teeth would be desirable although, as noted above, it is unclear that the IGF would be able to adopt policy recommendations that are sufficiently detailed to be effective. Turning the IGF into another highly politicised UN body, like the UN Human Rights Council, should be avoided. Whilst a new treaty protecting human rights online sounds like a good idea in principle, in practice, it seems both highly impractical and unnecessary for the following reasons. • Firstly, adopting international treaties is a very resource-intensive exercise (e.g. WCIT-new ITRs). Given that a broad range of instruments are already available, especially the ICCPR, the prospect of new treaty negotiations seems unrealistic. • Secondly, and more to the point, it is wholly unclear what a specific human rights online treaty would add to the protection already available under the ICCPR and other international standards. The ICCPR already provides protection of the right to freedom of expression through any media of choice, including the Internet (see also the General Comment 34 and Resolution on the Promotion, protection and enjoynment of human rights on the Internet). The new treaty on the FOE on the Internet then bears the risk of watering down existing human rights standards and of fragmenting the Internet. It is also worth bearing in mind that a number of Internet declarations have already been issued from various quarters without any obvious practical impact. • Thirdly, even if a new treaty attempted to flesh out some aspects of Internet policy in more detail, it seems highly unlikely that Member States would agree to such a treaty. This is already apparent from the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement in relation to intermediary liability. That said, if the IGF were to be turned into an IGF+, it might be worth looking into synthesising the various available standards and policies (e.g. OECD, COE) that could then be adopted as IGF recommendations. But that seems a long way away.

12/11/2013 9:21 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2969498995)

I would support internationalizing (or denationalizing) ICANN, which I view as a largely symbolic, yet important move. I am in support of reforming the relationship between ICANN and the U.S. in favor of an arrangement that is viewed as more legitimate globally, however in the age of mass, indiscriminate government surveillance, I don’t see the ICANN issue as the most pressing order of the day. (I do realize that’s an American perspective…) I would also support proposals to reform and strengthen the IGF. With regards to the idea of developing a new treaty protecting human rights online, I have some reservations. On average, international human rights treaties have taken over 5 years from drafting to ratification. Three have taken more than 10 years. With the pace of technological innovation, it is not difficult to see how a treaty negotiated today on human rights on the Internet might be severely deficient even by the time it enters into force. Perhaps a better approach would be advance our understanding of how existing international human rights law frameworks apply to the digital environment. For example, the UN Human Rights Committee’s General Comment 34 on provides guidance on interpreting Article 19 of the ICCPR, and perhaps a new general comment on Article 17 could contribute to understanding of online privacy. Another alternative to a treaty could be a set of global principles on internet governance endorsed by all stakeholders. Rather than a new treaty, this could be more similar to a UDHR for the internet, to continue the analogy.

12/10/2013 8:42 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2968526464)

If ICANN had to build protection of human rights into its policies (at least as much as it builds protection for trademark rights into its policies, which is a lot).

12/10/2013 4:39 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967926810)

Will internationalizing ICANN enable it to evolve as per the above? I think the jury is out. The same is true for other structures or the the call for new structures. We should not be changing IG structures simply because one set of stakeholders believes that it is necessary for them to be able to "carry out their roles and responsibilities" however defined. What is the actual and practical demonstrable need? Nor should reform should not be dictated by the political aims of some governments. Reform should be cautious an considered and should show that it will credibly enhance the purpose and functioning of the entity/mechanism in question (as per the criteria above, among others). Yes, the IGF should be "reformed" as there is a demonstrated and practical need reflecting the criteria above. Yes, all organizations, mechanisms and structures that are directly or indirectly related to the management of the Internet should regularly review their own processes/structures to ensure that they meet the criteria listed above. And this includes intergovernmental organizations, governments, etc., that are or have the ambition of addressing Internet issues.

12/10/2013 3:53 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967804515)

1. Internationalisation of ICANN and IANA. This discussion should consider inputs from the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Review Team process and, where relevant, the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation http://unctad.org/en/pages/MeetingDetails.aspx?meetingid=396 . We note that ICANN is continuing to evolve as a unique community with an increase in numbers of government participating, improved transparency and accountability mechanisms, and looser ties with the US government than when it was established. Suggestions for internationalisation of ICANN and IANA functions must take this into account and not cut across processes for improvement which are underway, but rather seek to build on them and improve overall. This is because even in a body such as ICANN where much attention has been given to improving participation, results are mixed. For example, government voices within ICANN are increasingly empowered, but, they often exercise this power by giving advice directly to the board, rather than by participating in substantive policy discussions within ICANN. And civil society groups are not represented evenly compared to private sector groups (including commercial, business and intellectual property constituencies). In addition, within ICANN, in terms of power and influence however, civil society still does not have much of either, in spite of being an active participant in ICANN processes since its inception. ICANN has not, for example, included any civil society participants in its High Level Panel (which is informing ICANN participation in the Brazil meeting), nor does it seem to consider this necessary. ICANN can be seen as an example of a process where the overall structure is multi-stakeholder, but power is mostly to be shared, and contested, between business and government. Any reform of ICANN must therefore addressed these power imbalances between, and within, stakeholder groups. Internationalisation, for example, should be multi-stakeholder and not government only. In addition, there are some specific issues which ICANN must address, particularly those of relevance to developing countries. These include ensuring financing is available to address the effective participation of all marginalised people in the global information society by redirecting some of the revenues from gTLD domain name registrations to developing countries to: - support national and regional internet governance processes, - promote better access to the internet, and - improve capacity building to ensure timely switch-over to IPv6.     2. An international set of principles (or a civil framework) for internet policy making that are fully harmonised with existing human rights agreements. There has been considerable work on principles, including: - the recent principles workshop at the global IGF 2013 (source/ref material?) - Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights And Principles: http://www.internetrightsandprinciples.org - APC Internet Rights Charter: https://www.apc.org/en/node/5677/ - others - please list 3. Reinforce the United Nations’ Internet Governance Forum process (IGF). The IGF needs to be strengthened and improved. Most of these improvements have been identified in the report of the CSTD Working Group on IGF Improvements. Many of these improvements relate to increasing developing country participation. As noted in our WGEC Questionnaire Response: A key benefit of the multi-stakeholder model of internet public policy-making is that the sum of all stakeholder inputs can be greater than their parts. The investment of time and resources in opening a policy process to the input of a multiplicity of voices and interest groups, from the most powerful to the least powerful, can lead to the outcome of the process not just being as fair as possible, it can also make it more sustainable. Actors who need to comply with or implement policy are much more likely to do so if they were part of its design. For EC to enable other stakeholders to carry out their roles and responsibilities it is necessary for all stakeholders, including governments to: - Work towards agreeing on public interest principles and modalities for policy-making and participation which take account of, and manage, conflict of interest (particularly important when industry is involved in policy development processes); - Participate actively in discussions on principles of internet governance, and principles for multi-stakeholder cooperation (discussions at the IGF and elsewhere); - Utilise the unique opportunity provided by the IGF as an established forum of internet policy dialogue to reach agreement, in the context of the IGF, on such principles and modalities by 2016; - Facilitate and encourage the establishment of inclusive and effective multi-stakeholder processes at national level, based on the WSIS principles, and use these as a basis for orienting their country's participation in regional and global fora; - Use the existing decentralised nature of the IGF process to enable more stakeholders, particularly at regional and local level, to be involved; and to serve as a model for policy-making processes; - Democratise existing processes by addressing barriers that prevent people and organisations that are affected by their outcomes from participation. Such barriers include gender, financial resources, language, experience,  knowledge and distance. Existing efforts to address these, including remote participation, need to be strengthened; - Establish a culture of respect for one another in order to facilitate effective cooperation, but not to do this at the expense of recognising that there are different interests among stakeholders, and that these need to be debated vigorously. In addition, other global, regional and national spaces and processes should be used to build capacity of the diverse stakeholders on internet governance and internet policy matters. There is a need for peer-to-peer learning and to offer specialised capacity building opportunities which enrich the experience and understanding of policy makers and regulators in particular on internet governance and policy matters and to contribute, in that way, to make policy and regulation development a more effective process at national level. Finally, it is important to mention the use of other processes to build capacities in IG. As noted in APC’s WSIS submission in relation to internet governance and policy matters: The WSIS process is a privileged space to engage proactively with policy makers and regulators (and non-governmental groups) to build their capacity on internet governance and internet policy matters. There is a need for peer-to-peer learning and to offer specialised capacity building opportunities which enrich the experience and understanding of policy makers and regulators on internet governance and policy matters and to contribute, in that way, to make policy and regulation development a more effective process at national levels. Inputs to the Brazil meeting could usefully reinforce the inter-relationships in these spaces.

12/10/2013 1:24 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967448792)

Reforming IGF to a mere showpiece event to a result oriented forum should be a start in itself. It should go a long way in empowering the forum and ensure a result based discussion. Apart from that one member NGO's should not be promoted as it only promotes their self-interest and neither do they represent a wide stakeholder group within their own country. Apart from internationalising ICANN is not something that i would support because its not bound by any international law but only US based law. Apart from this an international treaty of protecting human rights online is the need of the hour but first the intermediaries should be asked whether they are broadcasting or narrowcasting the media? If they are narrowcasting then the intermediaries do not deserve any support. Case in point is PageRank which is the google algorithm in which sites that recieve lots of links from other sites receive lots of links are ranked highly. The question is if the intermediaries can censor content themselves then whom are we supposed to support. Or if supporting them we are heading into a wild goose chase? Therefore i shall support protection of human rights provided if intermediaries themselves do not censor any content

12/10/2013 10:52 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2967229198)

I support all of the above. The "new treaty" would not necessarily be a treaty, however; more of a set of soft law principles like a globalised Marco Civil. This could either be developed through the Brazil meeting process, or by a reformed IGF (not by the current IGF, which lacks that capacity). In any case, this feeds back into my Multistakeholder Internet Policy Council proposal which I submitted for consideration of the CSTD WGEC.

12/5/2013 10:04 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2958324897)

There are two specific areas of interest for me. Internationalising ICANN – here my preferred model would be to establish ICANN as an independent not for profit organisation that has diplomatic status. This could be in the Netherlands using the model of several organisations based in The Hague (such as the international Criminal Court) Reforming IGF to give it more leadership, a reformed MAG. More focused outputs and perhaps a MIPOC as an additional layer New normative standards. I would favour the IGF trying to synthesise existing regional and specific sets of principles (including the CoE and OECD) into a comprehensive normative standard based firmly on human rights values

12/4/2013 2:41 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2956201756)

My preference would be some sort of international agreement, some review mechanisms, and some widely acceptable decision democratic, accountable and transparent decision making processes.

11/30/2013 1:16 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2948688252)

A new treaty protecting human rights online since it presupposes establishment of a global standard in respect to promotion and protection of expression on line.

11/29/2013 4:15 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2948131335)

Reforming IGF. Maybe not into a strictly binding decisional body, but something similar to MDG, with Goals for that need to be achieved.

11/29/2013 7:41 AM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947620486)

More openess and inclusiveness from Civil Society

11/28/2013 9:03 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947224478)

See above. In addition, it would be desirable to develop a more comprehensive framework for multi-stakeholder work on pressing issues to be conducted between IGFs. The preparation of the WSIS+10 event is not a reform per se but it is important to make sure that this event - whatever its ultimate format - is open to all stakeholders and participatory. It would be unacceptable to see it be less open than the WSIS event in Tunis ten years ago and even less multi-stakeholder than what ITU itself has done in the last years in the WSIS Forum or the WSIS+10 preparatory events.

11/28/2013 6:58 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2947112562)

yes, all of the above. I think the questions have to be looked at with a more useful methodology than political debate in order to move on.

11/27/2013 7:12 PM [View respondent's answers](https://www.surveymonkey.com/analyze/browse/Yx1LKIc_2BIqwjDPqKBlhogZPV_2FiC1RimgyH6WxEoWVX8_3D?respondent_id=2945627104)

**Plus two stand alone submissions:**

1. **How do you understand existing governance arrangements**

There are multiple valid approaches that can be adopted to analyze governance arrangements. For example, we may take a functional approach (separating technical from policy-oriented organizations) or a geographical approach, separating national organizations from international ones. I prefer to look at the different layers of the Internet to analyze arrangements because of cross-border and international impacts of national policies, and because when we label an organization as “technical” we tend to overlook the fact that technical solutions are not neutral; they express policy options based on a set of beliefs shared by the technical community.

**Infrastructure layer:**

* The infrastructure layer overlaps with telecommunications. The international norms and the standardization are developed by ITU, therefore they are government-led. Nevertheless, since liberalization of the telecommunications sector, the decision to invest or not on infrastructure, as well as issues related to Internet penetration and market prices are made by a few large companies that control the telecom sector worldwide. As a government-based organization, ITU reflects the fact that many governments now have poor regulation or poor oversight over the telecom sector: ITU has shown little power to foster infrastructure deployment or push for more affordable access. The governance of Internet infrastructure apparently is government-led, but in fact its governance is based on a global oligopoly. As an example, the government of a big country with a large market like Brazil has been taken hostage by the lobby and the political influence of telecom companies, and the blocking of Marco Civil is Congress is a sign of that. Small and less developed countries are in no conditions to make companies comply with norms for universalization and affordability, not to mention to push for transparency reports from companies.

**What is the case for reform and on what grounds (eg better protection of human rights and democracy, better representation of global south**)

* There is not a lack of global institutions when it comes to the infrastructure layer, but the role that ITU plays is peripheral when it comes to key issues such as infrastructure deployment, affordability and accountability in the telecom sector (some telecom companies cooperated with the wiretapping of submarine cables, for instance, but it will hardly be a topic on ITU´s agenda). Due to its increasing loss of de facto influence over telecommunications and due to a scenario of digital convergence, ITU is keen to expand its role to issues that go beyond telecommunications, even expanding to other layers, to guarantee its survival. ITU also seems, for some countries, the only viable one-stop-shop to discuss public policy issues. Two points that could be discussed, in a process of reform of arrangements is: a) the need for ITU to stay focused on its original mission and even to be reinforced with the purpose of carrying it out; b) the need for a global rediscussion of the responsibilities of telecom companies, especially on the field of universalization, affordability and also transparency of their operations, because vulnerabilities in the infrastructure layer allow for massive violations of rights. In addition, individuals as consumers are currently poorly protected and assisted. Just an example: consumers should not have to pay for the investment that telecom companies will probably need to make to transport an increasing volume of streaming data from platforms like Youtube and Netflix. Telcos should either narrow their margin of profit or reach an agreement to share costs with big companies. But currently internet companies have successfully blocked any discussion about costs and the telcos are pushing additional costs downstream to the consumer. Could this rediscussion take place in a government led organization like ITU, or it would be more fit for a new or reformed multistakeholder platform? I tend to believe that the later is a better option.

**Technical standards**

* The standards layer will be oversimplified here in the interest of being concise. The point of departure is Lessig´s idea that “code is law”. The technical bodies do not only keep the Internet running. When they make choices about architecture, they make policy choices. One example of this was the discussion that reportedly took place during last IETF´s meeting on how to make mass surveillance more difficult through architecture. Of course, trying to hamper surveillance is a very positive goal, and the ethos of the technical community - having interfaces with free software and other similar groups - is mostly very prone to promoting freedom. But ethos and culture are mutable over time and we need to think about the governance of the Internet in the future. If code is law, then transparency about the choices that are being made on the architecture level are very important. It is pointless to say that the lists of IETF, for instance, are open and that anybody can contribute in a RFC. Those who do not possess a very specific knowledge – hard science technical knowledge – are excluded due to lack of “vocabulary” and understanding. In a democratic society, even the most difficult and “technical” topics need to be set forth in a comprehensive way for the average person in order to allow inclusion. It should not be different with the technical discussions about this layer. On the other hand, the technical community needs to be an integral part of policy development. Disconnection among regulation and the technical aspects of the Internet originate still-birth or ineffective regulatory policies, and there are many examples of that on national level.

**What is the case for reform and on what grounds (eg better protection of human rights and democracy, better representation of global south**)

The governance of technical standards is flexible and decentralized, and this is a good model that allows quick development and innovation. The governance of this layer should continue to be led by the technical community, but problems such as the aforementioned opacity and insulation should be addressed. There should be a process of horizontal dialogue and coordination between the technical bodies and other non-technical bodies. For instance: the main organizations that are part of the technical community should issue periodic reports of the technical options they are adopting and why. This report should be sent to a one-stop-shop platform, if one is created, or to an improved and empowered IGF. Non-binding comments and suggestions should be made to the technical organizations. In addition to increasing transparency, this would facilitate a process of convergence in which policy and regulation take technical aspects increasingly into account.

**Content and applications layer**

The content and applications layer is the most complex and diverse. National regulation co-exists not only with international treaties produced by organizations such as WIPO and UNESCO, but also overlap and are superseded by private transnational regulation through terms of use of platforms such as Facebook and Google services. These terms of use disregard basic notions of privacy and may serve as justification to hinder FoE when content is removed based on their vague terms.

Social and economic rights and content diversity are issues at stake in the current governance arrangement of this layer. The same goes for civil and political rights. The tension between privacy and security is clear, specially after the Snowden affair, and the undermining of privacy (by private or governmental actors) inhibits freedom of information and expression. There is also the problem of securitization of issues, in which topics on the agenda are increasingly labeled as national security concerns. Securitization may undermine human rights, transparency and accountability of policies.

**What is the case for reform and on what grounds (eg better protection of human rights and democracy, better representation of global south**)

On the content and applications layer, the fragmentation of the work of existing organizations and the existence of orphan issues (security, privacy) shows the need for an institutional arrangement to serve as focal point. This could facilitate participation of developing countries, could embody a decision-making multistakeolder institutional option for policy development, and could facilitate to identify in which layers of the Internet a human rights look is currently lacking. Today, HRs discussions are predominantly focused on the content layer.

This arrangement could: a) give more coherence to the policies discussed in different parallel fora; b) provide developing countries with a one stop shop where they could grasp all that is being discussed in terms of Internet related issues; c) send suggestions to existing organizations regarding approaches they could adopt or policy options they could take into account when discussing Internet-related issues under their purview; d) be the original forum where orphan issues are primarily discussed.