

**Timestamp**

8/31/2013 10:50:37

**The information solicited through this questionnaire will only be used in aggregate form, unless otherwise authorised by the respondent. Do you authorise us to cite/share your views individually?**

Yes

**Please enter your contact details:**

(a young international NGO with seat in Switzerland)

Organization: GodlyGlobal.org

Address: GodlyGlobal.org c/o Norbert Bollow, Weidlistrasse 18, CH-8624 Grüt

Email: nb@GodlyGlobal.org

**1. Which stakeholder category do you belong to?**

Non-Government

**If non-government, please indicate:**

Civil society

**If non-government, please indicate if you are:**

a young organization not yet formally accredited

**2. What do you think is the significance, purpose and scope of enhanced cooperation as per the Tunis Agenda? a) Significance b) Purpose c) Scope**

a) Significance: Enhanced cooperation is critically important for enabling governments to fulfill their various responsibilities in the information society context, including in particular in regard to ensuring that the global information society is developed in a way that fully respects and upholds the human rights of all people everywhere. In particular in regard to influencing the ways and directions in which information and communication technologies and the relevant standards are developed, governments are unable to fulfill their human rights obligations separately. In these areas, countries can fulfill their human rights obligations only through cooperation beyond what has been happening so far, i.e. enhanced cooperation.

b) Purpose: As clearly stated in para 69 of the Tunis Agenda, the purpose of the particular kind of enhanced cooperation that the Tunis Agenda refers to is: To enable governments to carry out their roles and responsibilities.

c) Scope: As clearly stated in para 69 of the Tunis Agenda, the scope of the particular kind of enhanced cooperation that the Tunis Agenda refers to is: International public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

**3. To what extent has or has not enhanced cooperation been implemented? Please use the space below to explain and to provide examples to support your answer.**

The needed kind of enhanced cooperation, as per the demand of the Tunis Agenda, has not yet been implemented.

Oversight of ICANN and IANA is still unilaterally US-based, and these institutions are still unilaterally subject to US law.

Or consider for example the issue of the protection of communications privacy for communications via the Internet. There are no effective institutions that would allow concerned governments to cooperate in protecting their citizens and residents from trans-border surveillance by foreign intelligence services.

#### **4. What are the relevant international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet?**

Here are some of the most urgent and important:

- \* Protection of communications privacy.
- \* Moving the oversight over key Internet governance processes from being subject to a legal system that has only very weak if any protection for the human rights of people who are neither citizens nor residents of a specific country, to some kind of framework in which the human rights of all people are treated as being of paramount importance.
- \* Legal standards to ensure the right to use Free Software on computers and all other kinds of communication devices, and to ensure the absence of any incompatibilities or other unreasonable obstacles to the use Free Software.
- \* Legal standards and incentives for website accessibility for persons with disabilities.
- \* Regulation of accessibility requirements for ICT devices that are produced for the global market. For example the current situation is unacceptable where reasonably priced “ebook” electronic book content is made available only for specific proprietary ebook reader devices, which are not accessible to persons with visual disabilities.

Also all the issues identified by the Working Group on Internet Governance are still pertinent. Furthermore, for just about every public policy issue that is pertinent at a regional, national or international level, it is nowadays becoming important to consider the information society implications related to that public policy issue. All such considerations are in fact relevant international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet.

#### **5. What are the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders, including governments, in implementation of the various aspects of enhanced cooperation?**

First of all, on all international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet, there needs to be multi-stakeholder discourse that develops a shared understanding of the issues: What are the issues, what are the different perspectives, concerns and interests related to each of issues, what are the possible strategies for addressing that issue, what is known about desired and undesired effects of each of the possible courses of action.

It is necessary for this to create an institutional framework that allows this discourse to take place, as per the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force proposal, see <http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1> .

#### **6. How should enhanced cooperation be implemented to enable governments, on an equal footing, to carry out their roles and responsibilities in international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet?**

Initially as per the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force proposal, see <http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1> .

Then the discourse in the context of the Working Groups of the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force will show that for some issues further international institutions are needed, and there will be reform proposals arising out of the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force to enhance existing international institutions, and to create new ones, as appropriate.

However there are some issues where the need for such institutions is so clear and urgent that it does not make sense to wait with establishing those institutions until the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force has been established and can be used to work out a proposal. These include the creation of an UN institution to take over the oversight function over ICANN and IANA from the US government, and the creation of an UN institution that works to enable governments to protect their citizens and residents from trans-border surveillance by foreign intelligence services.

#### **7. How can enhanced cooperation enable other stakeholders to carry out their roles and responsibilities?**

Enhanced cooperation enables governments to carry out their roles and responsibilities. These responsibilities of governments largely consist in enabling every human being to live a good life in full enjoyment of their human rights, while also enabling all other stakeholders to carry out their roles of responsibilities towards that aim, and preventing egoistic stakeholders from doing too much harm.

**8. What are the most appropriate mechanisms to fully implement enhanced cooperation as recognized in the Tunis Agenda, including on international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and public policy issues associated with coordination and management of critical Internet resources?**

Several mechanisms are needed.

The most important and urgent need is to create something like the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force proposal, see <http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1> .

For some issues no further international action will be needed beyond internationally coordinated recommendations for actions that can be taken nationally, together with international soft-law documents that explain how the internationally recognized human rights apply in specific information society contexts. Such recommendation and explanation documents can be developed through the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force, while the authority for accepting or rejecting such recommendations remains in the hands of the appropriate national bodies such as parliaments, as well the UN General Assembly and specialized international bodies of the UN system.

However, there are other issues where new, issue-specific internationally institutionalized coordination bodies or oversight functions are needed.

In general, it will be possible to develop corresponding proposals through the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force.

However there are some issues where the need for such institutions is so clear and urgent that it does not make sense to wait with establishing those institutions until the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force has been established and can be used to work out a proposal.

These include the creation of an UN institution to take over the oversight function over ICANN and IANA from the US government, and the creation of an UN institution that works to enable governments to protect their citizens and residents from trans-border surveillance by foreign intelligence services.

**9. What is the possible relationship between enhanced cooperation and the IGF?**

The work of the institutions implementing the Tunis Agenda's enhanced cooperation mandate must be made completely transparent to the IGF community, and subject to discussion at the IGF in particular in the context of workshops. The corresponding output documents as per the recommendations of the WG on Improvements to the IGF should in turn be taken in consideration as input documents by the institutions implementing the enhanced cooperation mandate.

**10. How can the role of developing countries be made more effective in global Internet governance?**

First of all it needs to be made clearer to everyone that the specific needs of poor people in regard to being able to use the Internet fully (for example, not everyone is able to get a credit card or equivalent means for conducting financial transactions via the Internet), and how the Internet can be part of strategies to overcome poverty, are centrally important topics in the context of Internet governance discourses.

For example, the so-called Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) which fulfills the role of

program committee for the IGF has in regard to the 2013 IGF in Indonesia rejected a workshop proposal on the topic "The roles of the Internet in anti-poverty strategies" on the basis that too many MAG members considered that topic to be unrelated to Internet governance. That rejection is absolutely ridiculous. How can Internet governance pursue the objective of "Sustainable Human, Economic and Social Development" (as spelled out explicitly as the main theme of the 2012 IGF meeting), if the roles of the Internet in anti-poverty strategies cannot be discussed?

Hence it seems that in actual reality too many of those who are currently directing the Internet governance discourse interpret "sustainable development" in a way that does not involve actually thinking about the problems related to poverty. Those problems are however the primary issues that developing country governments need to prioritize, both in order to fulfill their human rights obligations and in order to fulfill the expectations of their electorate.

Then, once the specific concerns and needs of developing countries have been given their rightful place on the agendas of Internet governance discourses, the work of developing strategies for addressing those concerns and needs should begin in earnest. This can be done for example in the context of the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force proposal, see <http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1> .

At that time it will start making sense for developing country governments to give participation in Internet governance discourses the kind of high priority that is necessary for effective engagement.

#### **11. What barriers remain for all stakeholders to fully participate in their respective roles in global Internet governance? How can these barriers best be overcome?**

One major barrier relates to agenda-setting. Too many of those with power over the agenda in regard to the discourse at the IGF and other Internet governance institutions are strongly influenced by careerist motivations. These motivations go strongly against allowing discussion topics which are outside the set of topics on which the Internet governance careerists can competently participate in the discussions, and these motivations further go strongly against allowing discussion topics which can only result in embarrassments for proponents of the neo-liberal agenda. Examples of this agenda-setting problem are the rejections of the workshop proposals on the topics "the roles of the Internet in anti-poverty strategies" and "regulating global Internet businesses - need for global frameworks" for the 2013 IGF.

In the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force proposal, see <http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1> , this agenda setting problem is addressed by ensuring that no-one has the power to suppress discussion topics.

Another major barrier is that many stakeholders cannot afford the expenses of international travel, which in many Internet governance is effectively a requirement to fully participate. Even though for example in regard to IGF meetings a lot of effort is invested towards facilitating remote participation, the reality is that this does not work as well as is sometimes claimed, and even when it works, the remote participants have no chance to participate in the various informal discussions e.g. in corridors which are often the most important part.

In the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force proposal, see <http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1> , this problem is addressed by creating a discourse that is conducted in its entirety via the Internet. This is possible for the tasks and roles envisioned for the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force, but it will not be possible for all governance fora and institutions. In regard to those fora and institutions where international travel is necessary for everyone outside the host country in order to be able to fully participate, travel funding must be made available that allows significant numbers of civil society and small business entity representative to participate without having to worry about the travel expense. Of course, appropriate checks and balance need to be put in place to ensure that this funding goes to stakeholders who are able to contribute an independent perspective of their own, and not to sock puppets, astroturf groups, and the like.

A third major barrier is the necessary time investment for gaining a sufficiently deep understanding of the issues at stake and the pertinent viewpoints and solutions strategies. Governments have a responsibility to ensure that the various significant viewpoints and ideas which exist among their societies will be appropriately represented. Governments therefore need to find out what these viewpoints and ideas are, and then tender contracts for representation of these viewpoints and ideas in the relevant international fora. These contracts should be awarded to NGOs with relevant expertise in view of these NGOs having already started engaging in developing those viewpoints and ideas, and each of the contracts should fund not only the time that is spent directly on representing a certain viewpoints and set of ideas in the international fora, but the entirety of the required effort for effective engagement.

**12. What actions are needed to promote effective participation of all marginalised people in the global information society?**

There are various and very different mechanisms that cause people to be marginalized. It is not possible to devise a single set of actions that will address the needs of all marginalized people equally. Rather, the needs of marginalized people need to be studied and categorized in regard to what are the mechanisms that cause them to be marginalized, and what are the specific obstacles that make it difficult for them to overcome the challenges which they are facing.

Then specific and effective strategies can be developed and implemented.

The strategy development part of this can take place at the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force, see <http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1> .

**13. How can enhanced cooperation address key issues toward global, social and economic development?**

By first building a shared understanding of whatever issues are key issues from any stakeholder perspective, and then developing strategies for addresses these issues. The strategy development part of this can take place at the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force, see <http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1> .

**14. What is the role of various stakeholders in promoting the development of local language content?**

We do not have expertise to comment on this question beyond the obvious observation that every stakeholder should of course work towards ensuring that all of their content is available in as many languages as reasonably possible.

**15. What are the international internet-related public policy issues that are of special relevance to developing countries?**

Protection of human rights of people in developing countries in relation to the use of information and communication technologies.

How to best make use of the Internet as it exists today for purposes of empowerment to overcome poverty.

How to direct the further development of the Internet in order to make it better suitable for purposes of empowerment to overcome poverty.

In particular, the development of better Internet based systems for financial transactions is important, to resolve the problem of discrimination against people who do not have a credit card.

Discriminate against residents of developing countries by providers of commercial online services.

**16. What are the key issues to be addressed to promote the affordability of the Internet, in particular in developing countries and least developed countries?**

In all significantly populated areas where nevertheless economic factors do not result in the market providing affordable and qualitatively good Internet connectivity, Internet infrastructure needs to be built which is publicly funded and publicly owned. In contexts where the responsible governments are not able to do this, the UN has a responsibility to step in.

**17. What are the national capacities to be developed and modalities to be considered for national governments to develop Internet-related public policy with participation of all stakeholders?**

National governments need to participate in fora such as the IGF and the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force, see <http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1>, and they need to promote the participation of other stakeholders.

In this context, it is important to be mindful of the fact that the necessary time investment for gaining a sufficiently deep understanding of the issues at stake and the pertinent viewpoints and solutions strategies is a significant barrier. Governments have a responsibility to ensure that the various significant viewpoints and ideas which exist among their societies will be appropriately represented. That is not a problem in regard to the viewpoints and interests of major corporations, but it is a problem in regard to all other viewpoints and ideas. Governments therefore need to find out what those other viewpoints and ideas are, and then tender contracts for representation of these viewpoints and ideas in the relevant international fora. These contracts should be awarded to NGOs with relevant expertise in view of these NGOs having already started engaging in developing those viewpoints and ideas, and each of the contracts should fund not only the time that is spent directly on representing a certain viewpoints and set of ideas in the international fora, but the entirety of the required effort for effective engagement.

**18. Are there other comments, or areas of concern, on enhanced cooperation you would like to submit?**

a) Developing good solution strategies for the various global public policy challenges requires international coordination and doing that in an appropriate manner costs a significant amount of money. This is a cost of globalization. Ultimately that cost is borne by the population of the world, regardless of whether the money is extracted say through taxation of corporations and it then goes towards the UN budget, or if the corporations sponsor those UN events that they wish to support. In both cases the money is ultimately paid by consumers as part of the price of services rendered. The difference is just that for one of the funding paths it is \*possible\* to organize it in accordance with democratic principles.

Therefore these costs need to be addressed through the budgets of national governments and the budget of the UN. Private sector donations should be neither solicited nor accepted, with possible exceptions only for the start-up phase of experimental coordination mechanisms with a clear goal to transition to full public sector funding as quickly as possible.

b) Specifically in regard to the Internet, involvement of government institutions has a very bad reputation. This has been caused by government institutions very often not appropriately understanding the technical and architectural aspects of the Internet, and also very often not appropriately understanding how the internationally recognized human rights need to be applied in Internet contexts. Addressing these deficits of understanding should be among the priorities of enhanced cooperation processes. Only to the extent that the governments succeed in fundamentally reforming their thinking processes in these regards can a strengthened role of governments in Internet related public policy be legitimate.

c) In any case, strengthening the role of the public interest in Internet related public policy is absolutely necessary. Today many public policy questions regarding the Internet are effectively decided in a totally non-democratic way, either directly by powerful corporations or

in standardization consortia where again business interests are the dominant driving force. That anti-democratic principle has recently been formalized in RFC 6852, which is currently under appeal, see <http://architf.org/> .

d) Furthermore, strengthening the role of rational discourse is absolutely necessary. In the various existing fora, many viewpoints and insights are voiced and then promptly ignored. That should not be allowed to happen. For each public policy issue, there needs to be a careful process to collect the various perspectives from all kinds of stakeholders and evaluate all proposals against the various concerns in particular in the light of the goal of sustainable human, economic and social development, and in regard to the potential of the proposals to strengthen the practical implementation and experience of human rights, democracy, and rule of law.

e) In the pursuit of rational discourse, emotions such as fear and hope should not be ignored. Rather, discourse techniques should be used that allow to deal with these emotions in a logical manner. That allows fears to be acknowledged and treated as a signal that there is a need to do careful systemic analysis and that there is a need for hope-inspiring solution proposals. Although explicitly addressing fear and hope is not part of classical logics, an effective technique for doing that is probably necessary for creating constructive discourse processes in which all stakeholders are welcome to participate and where the needs, views and concerns expressed by every participant will be taken appropriately seriously. See also the UN Secretary-General's recent remarks on "the way to build societies founded on hope instead of fueled by fear", <http://www.un.org/sg/statements/index.asp?nid=7046> .

f) In parallel to the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force proposal as described in <http://enhanced-cooperation.org/RFA/1> which proposes a practical mechanism for implementing the Enhanced Cooperation mandate of the Tunis Agenda, we also endorse the related Wisdom Task Force initiative as described in <http://wisdomtaskforce.org/RFB/1> which is designed so that it can be implemented independently of UN processes which are sometimes slow. Ideally both should be implemented, then they will be complementary with the Enhanced Cooperation Task Force focusing on recommendations for actions of the executive branch of government and the Wisdom Task Force focusing on recommendations for well-balanced legislation. If however the "process towards enhanced cooperation" foreseen in the Tunis Agenda does not lead to the institution of such an Enhanced Cooperation Task Force, it is possible as a "plan B" for the Wisdom Task Force to take on both of these roles.

g) We also endorse the submissions of IT for Change and BestBits.  
[http://www.itforchange.net/civil\\_society\\_input\\_to\\_the\\_UN\\_Working\\_Group\\_for\\_global\\_governance\\_of\\_the\\_Internet](http://www.itforchange.net/civil_society_input_to_the_UN_Working_Group_for_global_governance_of_the_Internet)  
<http://bestbits.net/ec/>