Mapping of international Internet public policy issues

Ms. Mervi Kultamaa
Economic Affairs Officer/WSIS Coordinator
Division on Technology and Logistics
UNCTAD

27 November 2014
Geneva, Switzerland
The framework of the project

- ECOSOC Resolution 2014/27 from 16 July 2014 entrusted the CSTD secretariat to continue the work initiated by the WGEC to:
  1. review the identified public policy issues pertaining to the Internet;
  2. list where there are existing international mechanisms addressing these issues;
  3. identify the status of mechanisms, if any, whether they are addressing the issue;
  4. attempt to identify gaps

- Working time: end of July-mid November 2014
- The outcome: database and summarizing report
1. Review the international Internet public policy issues

- The identified 40 issues were classified in 7 broad clusters:
  1. Infrastructure and standardisation (technical issues also cover public policy considerations)
  2. Economic
  3. Security
  4. Human rights
  5. Legal
  6. Development
  7. Sociocultural

- Issues are interrelated; classification can be only indicative.

- Relations between issues
2. List the mechanisms addressing the issues

- **643 mechanisms were identified.**
- **Discrepancy in the level of depth of mechanisms inherent in the mapping**
- **No orphan issue was identified without any mechanism addressing it**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor/Venue</th>
<th>Name/Description of Mechanism</th>
<th>Type of Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IGF</td>
<td>Policy discussion</td>
<td>Process - Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU</td>
<td>ITU Recommendations, regulations and decision related to telecommunications</td>
<td>Instrument Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU</td>
<td>Emerging Issues: Programmes on Next Generation Networks</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>GATS + Annex on Telecommunications</td>
<td>Instrument Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>Basic Agreement on Telecommunications</td>
<td>Instrument Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE</td>
<td>Standards related to LAN, Wireless and broadband</td>
<td>Instrument - Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSMA</td>
<td>Mobile telephone standards and regulation</td>
<td>Instrument - Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHO</td>
<td>Electromagnetic Project research</td>
<td>Programme - Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHO</td>
<td>Model Legislation for Electromagnetic Field Protection</td>
<td>Instrument - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICNIRP</td>
<td>International guidelines for electromagnetic radiation (mobile telephony)</td>
<td>Instrument - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETSI</td>
<td>European telecommunication standards</td>
<td>Instrument - Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3GPP</td>
<td>Mobile Broadband Standard (5G)</td>
<td>Instrument - Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECMA</td>
<td>Standards for information and communication systems</td>
<td>Instrument - Standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Identify the status of the mechanisms

- The status of the mechanisms was evaluated according to:
  a) What is the **TYPE** of the specific Internet public policy mechanism?
  b) What is the **FUNCTION** of the specific Internet public policy mechanism?
  c) What is the level of **PARTICIPATION** in the mechanism and the possibilities for participation by concerned stakeholders?
  d) Is an **INTERSECTORAL** approach used?
4. Attempt to identify gaps

- Some gaps were identified and clustered in broad categories as:
  - knowledge gaps,
  - policy gaps,
  - implementation gaps
  - capacity gaps

- References to the gaps identified through the WGEC/CG were retained

- Need for a commonly agreed definition of a gap and criteria for assessment
Possible gaps across issues

• The possible gaps relate to:
  1. Insufficient institutional capacity or resources
  2. Mechanisms for addressing Internet public policy issues in a holistic way
  3. Data and research
  4. Participation and inclusiveness
  5. Comprehensive capacity building and information sharing
Observations on mapping

• Mapping is never complete:
  – Changes over time, new issues and mechanisms appear
  – Every step increases clarity and brings new elements
• Need for solid methodology or criteria for the assessment of mechanisms and gaps
• Relations and links between issues and between mechanisms important
• Mapping increases information on internet governance and may help to overcome weaknesses
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