Inclusive IG ecosystems and digital cooperation

Internet has become a global communication, social, economic, and political phenomenon. The Internet's emergence radically changed international telecommunications. The Internet developed and spread without direction from intergovernmental processes, without generating rules of international law. Internet governance evolved through multi-stakeholder processes in which state and non-state actors collaborated on managing technical and operational tasks, such as standardizing communication protocols and managing names and numerical addresses on the Internet.

To bring Internet governance under governmental and intergovernmental control will dire consequences for innovation, commerce, development, democracy, and human rights, especially regarding censorship. The International Telecommunications Union (ITU) members recognize the right of access of Member States to international telecommunication services, creating concerns in an environment permeated with controversies about government power *vis-a-vis* Internet content, services, and governance.

Specially on issues like security and spam, that potentially support government efforts to regulate content indirectly, could provide international legal cover for measures that infringe on human rights.

In terms of international law, some governments have advanced their positions for more control, and that is how UN supports the multi-stakeholder approach by leveraging partners in the different regions, industry, and civil society, and by helping developing countries to benefit from an open, global Internet, to participate in multi-stakeholder processes, and to address Internet-related problems, such as cybersecurity, new technologies and infrastructure.

The internet ecosystem consists of very different aspects. County-Code Top-Level Domains (ccTLDs) operated according to local policies that are normally adapted to the country or territory involved. Regional, federal, state and local governments and their regulators have roles in setting policies on issues from Internet deployment to Internet usage. The Internet Architecture Board (IAB), the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), and the Internet Society (ISOC). Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) is responsible for the global coordination of the Domain Name System (DNS) and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) coordinates the system of unique names and numbers for an Internet secure, stable, and interoperable. The IETF is a large, open, international community of network designers, operators, vendors, and researchers concerned with the evolution of the Internet architecture and the smooth operation of the Internet. Internet Research Task Force (IRTF) to promote research of importance to the evolution of the future Internet by creating focused, long-term, and small Research Groups. ISOC takes action collectively to ensure that the Internet remains open, accessible, trusted, and secure. The International Telecommunication Union convenes specialists drawn from industry, the public sector, and R&D entities worldwide to develop technical specifications that ensure that each piece of communications systems can interoperate seamlessly with the myriad elements that make up today's complex ICT networks and services.

The United Nations' UNESCO, and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). NOG's global Policy Discussion Forums Organizations like the Internet Governance Forum(IGF) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), as well as national consultative forums, industry associations, and civil society organizations. Specialized Standards Bodies ;ile the European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), the Identity Commons, the IEEE Standards Association, the ISO ANSI, the Liberty Alliance Project, Open Source Communities, the Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards(OASIS), and the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C). Universities and Academic Institutions play a critical role in educating students and business people.

The term internet governance has evolved over time, and various groups have attempted to develop working definitions. The UN-sponsored World Summit on the Information Society defined internet governance as "the development and application by governments, the private sector and civil society, in their respective roles, of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programs that shape the evolution and use of the internet."

As contentious public policy issues have emerged, the concept of internet governance has conflated management of the technical resources necessary for its stability and continued expansion with discussion of behaviors emerging from the *use* of the internet at what is known as the content layer.

Many information policy experts emphasize that "internet governance" is not the product of an institutional hierarchy, but rather, it emerges from the decentralized, bottom-up coordination of tens of thousands of mostly private-sector entities across the globe.

States control internet-related policies within their own borders, such as passing laws prohibiting online gambling, protecting intellectual property, or blocking/filtering access to certain content. Some authoritarian governments censor political and social content much as they do in traditional media. Roughly half the world's internet users experience some form of censorship online, according to the OpenNet Initiative, an academic partnership that analyzes internet filtering and surveillance practices. Mechanisms of online censorship include the technical blocking of websites, search result removal, legal take-downs, and induced self-censorship. Furthermore, experts note that online censorship in some countries would not be possible without the compliance of the business community.

The Internet Governance Forum is an international group of governments and nongovernmental entities created in 2006 at the World Summit on the Information Society. Internet historians say the IGF, which meets annually to discuss internet-related policies, was in large part the UN's response to ICANN; IGF issues no binding outcomes of its proceedings in a venue where contentious public policy matters at the content layer of the internet can be freely discussed.

Some countries remain unsatisfied with ICANN's management of the DNS as well as the multistakeholder model of internet governance. In recent years, some countries have pushed to expand the influence of national governments at the expense of business and civil society groups.

U.S. tranfered the IANA function to the global community. That may set the stage for broader changes in other areas of internet governance, such as intellectual property rights and cybersecurity.

We say Internet *governance* and not *government* because many issues in cyberspace are not and probably cannot be handled by the traditional territorial national institutions. *Governance* implies a polycentric, less hierarchical order; it requires transnational cooperation amongst standards developers, network operators, online service providers, users, governments and international organizations if it is to solve problems while retaining the openness and interoperability of cyberspace. For better or worse, national policy plays an important role in shaping the Internet, but the rise of cyberspace has produced, and will continue to produce, new institutions and governance arrangements that respond to its unique characteristics.

IGP's analysis of the Internet governance space is informed by institutional economics, which identifies three broad categories of governance: markets, hierarchies and networks. *Markets* are driven by private transactions and the price mechanism. *Hierarchies* govern interactions through orders or compulsion by an authority, such as law enforcement by a state, a binding treaty, or the organizational control of a firm *Networks* are semi-permanent, voluntary negotiation systems that allow interdependent actors to opt for collaboration or unilateral action in the absence of an overarching authority. Internet governance involves a complex mixture of all three governance structures, including various forms of self-governance by market actors.

The Internet has been an engine of growth and development, bringing connectivity that bridges countries and cultures, connecting individuals, businesses, enterprises, and governments. The Internet and the resources it connects can inform, educate and empower and is a source of knowledge. Its contribution to social, cultural and economic growth and opportunity is recognized, but with its increased role and importance to societies, individuals and economies, comes key questions of governance, accountability, misuse, access. Governments and organizations and individuals understandably turn to models they understand or are familiar with to address concerns they view about the use, and potential misuse of the Internet. As the Internet expands, existing organizations, such as the UN agencies, regional organizations, and others are examining their roles. Newer organizations that follow more of the technical community's bottom up governance approach, such as ICANN, now co-exist alongside older intergovernmental organizations. The IGF was created by agreements in the Tunis Agenda, to further examine the kinds of issues and challenges emerging regarding the Internet's governance.

Today, national policy makers and global policy makers, alongside various stakeholders are engaging in developing approaches to deal with key issues, whether about bringing connectivity to the unconnected, or addressing rules for protection of individual privacy

online, or security of networks. A debate about who does what, and who should drive the Internet ecosystem has evolved rapidly.

Policies for Capacity and Skills that foster Digital Collaboration and Innovation

Internet governance schools have also emerged as a targeted and effective platform for building knowledge and leadership across the diverse and growing field of Internet development, policy and regulation.
Policy and regulation need to be developed inclusively to ensure that the jobs of the future offer decent and sustainable livelihoods for women and populations at the margins.
Discussion about inclusion of marginalized people should be at the centre of Internet governance and public policy conversations and not in the margins.
Preserving heritage and promoting local content needs sustainable local production infrastructures and markets so that people can make a living out of creating content.

The role of data governance in fostering economic growth (including for SMEs), innovation, social progress and sustainable development
■ Issues on which there is perceived a need for, but as yet no global consensus, such as the lack of a common framework for data protection and related issues around managing cross-border data flows and questions of jurisdiction
■ How to best ensure the development of people-centric frameworks at national, regional and international levels, as well as in related cross border issues, that respects human rights, empowers individuals and promotes sustainable development
■ The conditions and ethical frameworks needed to facilitate data-driven innovation while also ensuring fair competition, and fostering trust in the Internet and digital technologies

As data crosses borders, multiple legal and regulatory frameworks, such as personal data protection regulations, data disclosure requirements and
judicial redress processes often apply, with the potential to produce uncertainty in global data-driven supply chains, with the potential to adversely affect economic and social development, innovation, and as well as place constraints on freedom of expression and freedom of assembly, and introduce security risks.

The global trend towards urbanization has brought about challenges in urban mobility, public health, and equitable access to public services and equal opportunities. Increasing uptake of Internet of Things (IoT) in urban infrastructure also inevitably results in more data being produced, collected and shared. It is essential to ensure public services are people-centric and data-driven , with participation and transparency in the design of services.

A lack of adequate global and national human-centric data governance limits data’s potential as a key resource for sustainable development. Current data governance models support the concentration of access to data to only a few very large technology companies. Meanwhile, the human sources of data, as well as smaller businesses and

developing countries, are excluded from sharing and benefitting from the value of their own data, while simultaneously being vulnerable to data breaches and attacks on their privacy rights.

Artificial Intelligence and algorithms, if not governed effectively, can be used to monitor and manipulate behaviour, to besiege us with ever more targeted and intrusive advertising, to manipulate voters and stifle freedom of expression. Algorithmic discrimination affects labour market, the criminal justice system and access to public services.

Appropriate protocols for data interoperability need to be part of data governance models

Policy questions

With the increasing digitization of our economies and societies, debates related to the governance of the Internet are gaining momentum and have broadened their scope to encompass an ever-greater number of topics and governance aspects. Policy makers, businesses and citizens need to stay abreast of these developments and are faced with the challenges of rapid technological developments which impact on Internet access, use and governance. In this context, calls for strengthening capacities in Internet Governance are becoming more widespread and the national and international community is called upon to respond to those needs.

1. What are the key issues, problems and challenges that your organization focuses on in the IG space?
2. How can your local and regional organization engage in the collaboration to define public policies which maintain internet independence and MS spirit?
3. How can industry, academy and government meet together to define open regulations for a fruitful collaboration on the above-mentioned issues?
4. What are the most relevant outcomes from the Internet Governance Ecosystem: NETmundial, WSIS+10 HL, CSTD, ITU, ICANN, UNGA WSIS Review, and other relevant activities and events, identifying both positive and negative contribution to the Global IG process that you identify as a game changer? How to improve or balance them for the good of your organization?.
5. Which should be the best way to move towards a free and collaborative IG with a multistakeholder engagement in [[your] organization? – how is this approach evolving in the intergovernmental system: challenges, opportunities, strengths and weaknesses.
6. Which policies can support your capacity building requirements for the digital era? How can a collaborative perspective would take advantage of distributed resources for your own micro system?
7. How does IGF contribute to define and deploy new policies and regulations for a collaborative internet ecosystem? Which is the value it delivers to your local stakeholders?
8. How IGF+ should evolve and address collaborative opportunities? Who are there new competitors to the IGF? Which is their value proposition?
9. Are negotiated outcomes from IGF feasible for your organization and local environment? What are the issues which can move your organization and local participants into negotiation of outcomes?
10. How to call for and develop processes for a more active role in developing consensus in key areas of collaboration? What are the possible changes to the IGF structure and processes and resources?
11. Which are the structural design processes and bodies to make IGF more representative, participative, influencer, transparent and transversal, to help stakeholders feel more ownership?