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2003: World Summit on the Information Society

- WSIS Declaration of Principles makes specific reference to the importance of the right to freedom of expression in the "Information Society" in stating:

- We reaffirm, as an essential foundation of the Information Society, and as outlined in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; that this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers. Communication is a fundamental social process, a basic human need and the foundation of all social organization. It is central to the Information Society. Everyone, everywhere should have the opportunity to participate and no one should be excluded from the benefits the Information Society offers.”
United Nations Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, Frank La Rue, submitted a report to the UN Human Rights Council "exploring key trends and challenges to the right of all individuals to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds through the Internet." The report made 88 recommendations on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of expression online, including several to secure access to the Internet for all. Other recommendations call on states to respect online anonymity, adopt privacy and data protection laws, and to decriminalize defamation.

(read more: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right_to_Internet_access)
Issues for Discussion

Specific
Specific Issues for Discussion

- The Internet is governed through a patchwork of rules, norms and standards, which its stakeholders have developed largely independently and without reference to an overarching framework of principles.

- This has allowed the Internet to flourish through the adaptive and innovative development of new services, particularly in the technical sphere.

- But the absence of guiding principles has also allowed powerful stakeholders to drive changes to Internet governance that conflict with human rights and other emerging global norms of Internet user communities, though undemocratic processes such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, member-only discussions at the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), and North-heavy regional groupings such as the G8 and OECD.

- Is this status quo sustainable? Would it help to democratise global Internet governance if all stakeholders had a better way of developing guiding principles for policy makers in areas that are not already covered by multi-stakeholder democratic processes?

Specific Issues for Discussion

+ How will the discussions at the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation be able to address this? What progress (if any) was made at the ITU’s World Telecommunication/Information and Communication Technology Policy Forum (WTPF)?

+ What principles initiatives already exist, and what role could the IGF play in legitimising these at the global level?

+ What other mechanisms are available to advocate for the Internet we want, that is globally democratic and respects human rights?

+ This workshop will attempt to address these questions, including through the presentation of concrete proposals for practical reforms.

Thematic Area of Interest

- Enhanced cooperation
- Internet principles
- Multi-stakeholder Internet governance
How can enhanced cooperation enable other stakeholders to carry out their roles and responsibilities?

By bringing governments closer to the other stakeholders, the other stakeholders are also brought closer to governments. If enhanced cooperation is a process whereby governments (and existing Internet governance spaces/processes) are compelled to adhere to WSIS principles of transparency, accountability, etc., this can serve to create an approach to IG, and to existing and evolving IG processes and spaces that is rooted in the public interest and inclusive of all stakeholders. Even if the public interest is not always clear, such processes should, and could involve all stakeholders in negotiating a common understanding of what the broadest possible public interest is on any particular issue.

Source: http://bestbits.net/ec/
In conjunction with the closely related mandate for the formation of an Internet Governance Forum, is to address the perceived deficits described above. In particular the Tunis Agenda identifies that enhanced cooperation would enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities, in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet” (para 69).

Subtextually, the main purpose of Enhanced Cooperation as sought by governments was to provide a space where they could further deal with the dominant issue across both the summits – internationalization of Internet oversight. With IGF a mainly civil society initiative, albeit multi-stakeholder in conception, enhanced cooperation was a process in which governments would be the main actors.

Source: http://bestbits.net/ec/
The IGF complements the enhanced cooperation mandate, but as it stands, it does not fulfill that mandate. Some of us believe there is the potential for a significantly strengthened IGF, with appropriate long-term funding support, to host a new framework or mechanism to facilitate the development of globally-applicable principles on public policy issues through a multi-stakeholder process. If so, this would have be entirely new and supplementary to the IGF’s existing structures and processes, significantly differing from those that exist now such as the MAG, workshops and dynamic coalitions. In any case, regardless of whether any such new framework or mechanism is part of the IGF, the IGF’s existing structures and processes will be valuable in deepening the public sphere for multi-stakeholder discussion of Internet policy issues, which will be integral to the work conducted through the new framework or mechanism.

Source: http://bestbits.net/ec/
Pakistan – Youtube

Case Study
Protests erupted across the Arab world

Policy Matters: Govt devises mechanism to filter objectionable material on YouTube - Pakistan

**Policy Matters: Pakistan reportedly testing URL filters, may lift YouTube ban**

**Policy Matters: Pakistan prepares to end its year-long ban on YouTube**

Policy: Internet Freedom Strengthens Democracy

Source: [http://internetgovernancepolicy.blogspot.com](http://internetgovernancepolicy.blogspot.com)
Access and accessibility

Multilingualization of the Internet including Internationalized (multilingual) Domain Names

Cultural diversity

Accessibility policies for the disabled and Affordable and universal access

Reliability, and quality of service, especially in the developing world

Developmental aspects of the Internet

Human rights

Freedom of Expression

Data protection and privacy rights

Consumer rights
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Trade and commerce
  - e-commerce
  - copyright
  - patents
  - Trademarks

- Security and law enforcement
  - Internet stability and security
  - Combatting cybercrime
  - Other issues pertaining to the use and misuse of the Internet
  - Dealing effectively with spam
  - Protecting children and young people from abuse and exploitation
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