

# **High-level governmental dialogue: The Internet Ecosystem and UNESCO's role – which options for future action?**

## ***Panel report prepared by***

*Carolina Rossini, VP International Policy at Public Knowledge*

*To*

*UNESCO*

*[Omissis]*

## **Panel Description:**

With 3 billion Internet users and 7 billion mobile phone subscriptions, the Internet and the digital revolution is impacting on all spheres of public and private life, including crucial issues relating to access to information and knowledge, freedom of expression, privacy, and the field of ethics – that are all central to UNESCO's mandate. UNESCO's vision of inclusive Knowledge Societies is one that relies upon a free, open and trusted Internet that enables people to access information and knowledge from around the world, as well as to contribute these resources to local and global communities. The session will seek visions from high-level governmental representatives on the important question: what UNESCO, as a specific Intergovernmental organization within the wider Internet ecology, can do, as regards the Internet, that will optimize the realization of inclusive Knowledge Societies which foster a sustainable and human-rights based development worldwide?

This session is especially relevant to draft UNESCO Internet Study: Section 7. Conclusions.

## **Moderator:**

Indrajit Banerjee, Director, Knowledge Societies Division, UNESCO

## **Rapporteur:**

Carolina Rossini, Vice President for International Policy, Public Knowledge

## **Panelists:**

1. Chafica Haddad, Chair, Intergovernmental Council for the Information for All Programme (IFAP)
2. Philipp Metzger, Director General, Federal Office of Communications, Switzerland
3. Christopher Painter, Coordinator for Cyber Issues, US State Department
4. Alex Sceberras Trigona, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Malta and current Special Envoy of the Prime Minister of Malta

5. Albana Shala, Chair, International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC)

## Summary report

Most of the panelists provided their initial contributions to the debate by offering examples of some of their core projects and initiatives that address all or most of the topics focus of this conference. Some specific comments were made, generally including:

**Access:** Most panelists recognized the need to foster access, including meaningful access, which includes access to knowledge. Some contributed with statistics and country and bilateral or regional efforts to support access, specifically broadband.

**Freedom of Expression:** Panelists recognized that freedom of expression and access and access to information are intrinsically connected.

**Privacy:** Panelists recognized the need to balance this right with other rights and concerns. Panelists addressed both the relation of privacy and surveillance and consumer privacy and abusive use of consumer data by advertisers.

**Ethics:** Most participants supported a self-regulating approach, and one panelist called the attention for the need of capacity building and training in areas such as Africa, offering examples of some regional efforts.

**Panelists also addressed UNESCO's role in this space.** They comment on the important enabling role of Unesco, specifically when promoting knowledge development and interchange, through its publications, projects and conference. They stressed the need of Unesco to collaborate with other UN agencies and other sister international organizations, and some of the participants supported Unesco as the core forum to deal with Internet related discussions from an humanist and Human Rights approach. A specific suggestion was made regarding the creation of a resource hub and observatory.

**Finally, panelists also addressed the issue of Multistakeholderism:** Panelists recognized the core role of multistakeholderism as a crucial element and process-setting guide for the creation of robust results within Internet Governance.

## Complete Panelists Interventions:

*Chafica Haddad, Chair, Intergovernmental Council for the Information for All Programme (IFAP)*

- Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,
- In my capacity as Chairperson of the intergovernmental Information for All Programme (IFAP) it is my pleasure to participate in this High-level panel to represent the 26 Member States elected to the IFAP Council, as well as the various National IFAP Committees and expert Working Groups.
- The intergovernmental Information for All Programme was established in 2001. It provides a platform for international policy discussions, cooperation and the development of guidelines for action in the area of access to information and knowledge.
- This Programme supports Member States to develop and implement national information policy and strategy frameworks that support their efforts towards building knowledge societies.
- IFAP's work is focused on six priority areas of information accessibility, information for development, information ethics, information literacy, information preservation and multilingualism in cyberspace.
- The IFAP priority areas are all closely intertwined with the issues that are the subject of the study on Internet-related issues. Furthermore, the IFAP Council in its role as an advisory body to UNESCO was involved in the consultation on the development of the concept note and questionnaire that led to this study.
- For these reason I am especially pleased to participate in today's discussion and contribute to UNESCO's response to both the challenges and the opportunities that the Internet is opening up for women, for men, for developing and developed countries alike.
- IFAP has been actively involved in seeking to identify, bring together different stakeholder communities to promote exchanges of experiences, share information on latest trend and research, opportunities as well as emerging ethical, legal and societal challenges of cyberspace.
- Such efforts are fundamental to developing shared understanding, buy-in and building the consensus necessary to support follow-up actions. This sharing of experience, not only what is new, but also what works and is not working is vital for ensuring that our efforts add value and build on past knowledge.

- Supporting capacity-building, fostering the creation of networks of practice, conducting research and supporting the roll-out of national implementation pilots is essential for translating consensus and conceptual knowledge into actions on the ground.
- As part of IFAP's work in this area, we have developed policy tools such as the IFAP National Information Society Policy Template which provides guidance to Member States in the development of new policies, in reviewing their existing policies and also in implementing these policies.
- In partnership with the United Nations University (UNU) we have organized through a joint programme "Executive Training in Foundations of Information and Knowledge Leadership", capacity building for senior government officials in East Africa and South-East Asia to develop proficiency in the use of the IFAP Template.
- We are also seeking to convert the template from its current paper-based form to an on-line digital platform to which case studies, policy resources and data record could be added. This platform would also serve as an on-line community of practice and build bridges between policy and practice.
- IFAP has been conducting training in the use of the template in Africa, Asia and Latin American and the Caribbean and would like to extend this work to other regions.
- We also need to bear in mind that we need to recognize the importance of adaptation. Building in mechanism for stakeholder participation enables diverse viewpoints to be taken into account and so leads to more robust outcomes.
- Africa has been an important area of focus for IFAP given its large youthful population and the rapid penetration of Internet and mobile service.
- In the area of information literacy we have worked with regional youth networks enabling them to build skills to use ICT and to analyze information critically and to then apply it to addressing practical problems in their lives. By providing trainer of trainer programmes and working with regional partners we are able to build sustainable local capacity that can continue to operate after the initial projects and funding are over.
- Also in Africa since 2007 UNESCO through its partnership with the African Network for Information Ethics and the African Center of Excellence in Information Ethics (ACEIE) has been able to support the creation of a network of universities and researchers in more than 17 sub-Saharan countries working on information ethics.

- The ethical challenges of the Internet can be felt and seen everywhere, but much of the research in this area is taking place in Europe and North America. By contributing to developing the capabilities within African universities IFAP is helping to support the creation of national and regional research and policy ecosystems.
- These efforts have also been linked with other parts of the IFAP network. Consequently, there is internal learning as well as interest in understanding how these experiences can be transferred and adapted in other regions such as Latin America and the Caribbean where three conferences on information ethics are scheduled to be organized in 2015-2016.
- UNESCO has long recognized the power of increased access to information as a vehicle and tool for positive social transformation and development and the importance of engaging and empowering youth. Accordingly IFAP will be organizing an international conference at UNESCO on the Internet as a tool for development of youth against all forms of extremism and radicalism in June 2015. The conference will share experiences amongst experts and policy-makers on policy interventions and develop pilot projects which benefit youth and serve as a learning lab to closer link policy, practitioners, academics and stakeholders.
- By bringing the right people together around the right agenda, IFAP is crafting innovative solutions to the challenges that all societies face today. This is the soft power of UNESCO in action.
- Thank you for your attention.

*Philipp Metzger, Director General, Federal Office of Communications, Switzerland*

- Monsieur le Directeur, Excellences, Mesdames, Messieurs, chers collègues,
- Nous adhérons pleinement à la remarque de l'étude sur l'Internet de l'UNESCO selon laquelle « favoriser la poursuite de l'innovation sur Internet est un objectif important, mais il s'agit de bien plus que de simplement soutenir l'innovation technologique et sa diffusion ».
- L'Internet est une construction des hommes. Il n'est pas un écosystème virtuel dont nous ne serions pas responsables. L'Internet permet de partager très vite des sources quasi infinies du monde entier. Il ouvre ainsi un espace de dialogue continu sur les différentes manières de les voir et de les comprendre.

- Mais lorsque Umberto Eco dit que « la culture consistera surtout dans l'art de sélectionner les informations, et non plus de les acquérir puisqu'elles s'offrent, pléthoriques, à nous », on se rend compte de l'impact du paradigme de l'Internet sur les attitudes de ses utilisateurs.
- Le système engendré est donc complexe. Il n'y a dès lors pas de recettes simplistes. Mais les quatre dimensions identifiées, l'accès à l'information, la liberté d'expression, le respect de la vie privée et l'éthique, nous paraissent pertinentes pour examiner l'Internet dans sa globalité.
- Je me permets quelques brèves remarques sur chacune d'elles:
- **L'accès**
  - Plus de 3 milliards d'utilisateurs, 42 % de la population mondiale, sont en ligne.
  - C'est bien entendu insuffisant, mais si la fracture numérique tend à se réduire, peut-on en dire autant de celle qualitative des contenus ? La Suisse soutient fortement l'idée d'un engagement citoyen dans la mise en œuvre qualitative de l'accès universel à l'Internet. L'éducation joue un rôle primordial à cet égard pour que l'usage de la toile ne la transforme pas en une véritable jungle. Les Etats ont la responsabilité d'assurer une qualité d'apprentissage qui permet une utilisation intellectuelle et technique adéquates de l'Internet.
- **La liberté d'expression**
  - Quant à la liberté d'expression, elle est intrinsèquement liée à l'accès à l'information. La surveillance, le filtrage ou le blocage de contenus rendent l'exercice de cette liberté problématique. Pour ne pas l'entraver, il faut se garder d'appliquer excessivement les dispositions sur la diffamation et l'atteinte à la vie privée comme d'adopter des politiques d'autorégulation trop rigoureuses. Comprenez-moi bien: Nous devons combattre l'incitation à la violence et les comportements contraires aux droits humains, en veillant à ce qu'ils ne restent pas impunis – à l'instar de ce que nous faisons contre la pédophilie. Mais il importe de favoriser un équilibre entre les multiples acteurs du réseau qui soit juste. J'ajouterais encore que l'exercice de la liberté d'expression est aussi une question de responsabilité citoyenne.
- **Respect de la vie privée**
  - Chacun jouit du droit à un espace personnel distinct de l'espace public, selon la Déclaration universelle des droits de l'homme. Ceci implique un droit à l'autodétermination sur le plan de l'information. Mais contrairement à la communication traditionnelle, l'utilisateur de l'Internet n'est pas en mesure de pouvoir contrôler la circulation des informations sur lui-même. La notion de confiance joue un rôle essentiel, car d'aucuns risquent de limiter leur participation sur la toile ou de s'autocensurer, si la transparence compromet le droit à la vie privée. L'envahissement d'une « publicité » de plus en plus ciblée, pas toujours bienveillante, nous semble d'ailleurs une source de réelle

d'inquiétude. La définition d'une pratique et l'élaboration de règles multipartites nous semblent dès lors ici souhaitable.

- **Dimensions éthiques de la société de l'information**

- Le cyberspace permet des échanges extraordinaires et positifs. Mais au fil des évolutions technologiques façonnant les modes de pensée et les habitudes de tout un chacun, des aspects moins favorables se sont fait jour. Il est impératif de maintenir une réflexion holistique sur les buts que devrait remplir la toile dans le sens d'un développement durable.
- Les effets de cette « révolution numérique » inexorable ne nous sont pas encore tous connus. Nous avons la responsabilité d'en dessiner les contours et d'en gérer les risques, en nous souciant de la stabilité et de la prospérité de nos sociétés, dans le respect de la dignité humaine. Si l'autorégulation est la base de l'éthique dans la pratique, elle doit être assortie d'une veille. Dans ce contexte, les États ont à assumer leur responsabilité, par exemple en faisant respecter le principe de la transparence par l'économie numérique ou par ceux qui rassemblent des grandes quantités de données.

- **Conclusion**

- L'UNESCO de par ses expériences dans d'autres domaines ainsi qu'au bénéfice d'un réseau « multistakeholders » est un forum particulièrement adapté pour s'occuper des questions « humanistes » que soulèvent les développements d'Internet et du numérique. Avec d'autres partenaires comme le Conseil de l'Europe ou la Geneva Internet Platform, lieu de réflexion indépendant récemment créé par la Suisse que je l'invite à rejoindre, l'UNESCO pourrait jouer un rôle encore plus important dans la coordination des débats afin que l'Internet soit
  - un espace mondial ouvert et fiable d'émulation des connaissances, de dialogue interculturel,
  - au service de l'agenda post-2015 et
  - au service de la construction de la paix.

*Christopher Painter, Coordinator for Cyber Issues, U.S. Department of State*

- Good morning. Thank you to Director Banerjee for the invitation and to UNESCO, and Guy Berger in particular, for their hard work in preparing the report and organizing the conference.
  - The U.S. appreciates UNESCO's hard work in preparing the draft report and we look forward to a constructive discussion of its content. The report is timely and relevant for the current discussions of Internet policy issues.

- UNESCO was created to promote education and intercultural understanding and to facilitate international cooperation on science and technology in order to further universal respect for [justice, for the rule of law and for] the human rights and fundamental freedoms affirmed in the Charter of the United Nations. What better tool is there to achieve these aims than the Internet? So, it's clear that, to be successful, cyberspace must be part of UNESCO's activities going forward.
  - The sub-themes laid out for discussion reflect the breadth, diversity – and complexity – of cyber issues. I'll offer a few high-level comments and welcome discussion.
- ***INTERNET UNIVERSALITY***
    - UNESCO's Internet Universality concept frames the conversation in a helpful way.
    - The U.S. supports the four principles: an open, rights respecting, accessible and multistakeholder internet.
    - We see the value in the concept as a framework to guide UNESCO's participation in the broader discussions on Internet related issues that otherwise fall within the scope of its work.
- ***MULTISTAKEHOLDER***
    - The United States remains a strong supporter of a multistakeholder approach for ensuring an Internet grounded in respect for human rights, openness, inclusiveness, and innovation. The success of the multistakeholder model is reflected in the success of the Internet to date.
    - The U.S. regards cyberspace as something that is neither owned nor controlled by states. We see states as one of many stewards working to ensure that this resource is available to all the world's people.
    - Given the emphasis in the report on multistakeholder mechanisms, it's worth reflecting on how best to advance the multistakeholder dialogue on these issues. UNESCO has demonstrated itself as a valuable player in the field, producing reports and hosting meetings, working through the WSIS process and participating in the Internet Governance Forum.
    - We believe the Internet Governance Forum is an important mechanism to advance international efforts, including the work of UNESCO, in this field. We believe the IGF is an important catalyst for many of the activities contemplated in the draft study. UNESCO should look for ways to further capitalize on the IGF program and its preparatory process and look to mutually reinforce its own work and the work taking place in the IGF.
    - The U.S. has indicated our support for the renewal of the IGF mandate in the past and we believe the UN General Assembly should take action to ensure the long term viability and sustainability of the IGF as a multistakeholder, international forum to discuss Internet issues.
- ***ETHICS***



- For the United States, we believe discussions of ethics related to the Internet must begin with the fundamental understanding that human rights apply equally online as they do offline. This principle has been widely recognized by the international community. In fact, the UN Human Rights Council reaffirmed this principle by consensus just last year. So, further conversations on this topic need to begin by acknowledging the human rights obligations and commitments we each have.
- Notably, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights does not limit the protections given for expression only to what is termed “ethical” expression. In contrast, some states seek to define “ethical standards” to suppress speech they do not agree with. We stress that human rights are universal, and do not vary from place to place, or from culture to culture.
- Some view network technologies like the Internet as disruptive. But, when governments curtail freedom of expression online in the interests of social or political stability, they limit their future development. Their people miss out on conversations and debates elsewhere in the world, and they lack exposure to the free inquiry that spurs people to question old ways of doing business and invent new ones. Freedom of thought is part of what fuels educational development and economic innovation.
- In the United States, the ability of citizens to exercise their right to freedom of expression has paid big dividends. There is a clear connection between our freedom to access information and to express our thoughts, and the responsiveness and accountability of our government; between our flexibility to organize our companies in various ways, and the innovation that has emanated from those companies. In sum, our strong appreciation and protections for freedom of expression have helped foster our societies in creative and innovative ways that make us more productive, more efficient, and more prosperous.
- ***NEED NEW RULES FOR INTERNET?***
  - Finally, in the draft study there is a recurring question of if we need new laws and regulations to deal with the Internet. I would note some caution in this regard.
  - A general tenet of U.S. cyber policy is that laws and norms that apply offline also apply online. This principle has been affirmed twice now in the human rights context at the Human Rights Council. It was also one of the key outcomes from the last U.N. Group of Governmental Experts in the context of International Security.
  - I’d note that, in practice, re-negotiation of fundamental concepts for the Internet age could very likely result in a watering-down of the very rights and protections for which UNESCO’s collaborative efforts seek to further universal respect. In fact, some of the strongest advocates for re-writing the norms that apply to the Internet are governments with the worst records in this area.
- ***CONCLUSION***

- In conclusion, the report represents significant progress in our understanding of the issues and UNESCO's path forward. The United States has active initiatives that support many of the concepts in this paper, including protection of journalists online, tools for avoiding censorship and facilitating secure communication, promoting local content, and many others.
- Thank you for the opportunity to join this meeting today, and I look forward to the discussion

*DR. Alex Sceberras*, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Malta and current Special Envoy of the Prime Minister of Malta

- Dr. Alex Sceberras TRIGONA thanked UNESCO for convening participants in this House of Peace at a very appropriate moment in this critical year for Internet Governance. UNESCO also had a commendable record in officially Recognizing and Declaring the Human Genome as well as the Responsibilities of Present towards Future Generations as HERITAGE in 1997 following on the 1972 Convention on Protecting the World's Natural & Cultural HERITAGE as COMMON HERITAGE OF MANKIND. (CHOM)
- So, coming from Malta, Dr. AST hailed the excellent study on the Internet: "CONNECTING THE DOTS", which UNESCO had so diligently compiled and submitted to this Conference highlighting the Internet's UNIVERSALITY, adding, " I am therefore compelled to affirm and appeal that the Internet should be characterized as Common Heritage Of Mankind". In fact this is a reaffirmation of an earlier appeal made in 1997 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, by Dr. AST. Moreover, this characterization enables the generation of a prescriptive set of norms, rights and obligations, and not merely produce a scholarly though descriptive survey of the field which would be the case if we were merely concerned with analyzing the Internet as a GLOBAL RESOURCE or even as a GLOBAL PUBLIC GOOD though we could also consider how to contain GLOBAL PUBLIC BADS.
- Indeed, the UN LAW OF THE SEA (UNCLOS) is much more than recognizing the Area beyond national jurisdictions as a global concern or a global resource. It explicitly and legally recognizes that Area as the Common Heritage Of Mankind. This was a Maltese diplomatic initiative in 1967 following on the 1959 Antarctic model of international cooperation, not the Arctic model of colliding if not also overlapping sovereignties! They are truly poles apart! UNCLOS provides us with a safe middle ground. Obviously these international treaties concerned an enormous part of our planet in clear spatial geographical terms. The Internet as an artifact is different and therefore the cited Treaties can only be applicable by analogy and "mutatis mutandis". However we have come a long way from when it was thought in the immediate post-Cold War period that Cyberspace was beyond National Jurisdictions as it was nowhere, territorially speaking. It was widely held to be in a "no-sphere". Then with the evident localization of each and every PC we got back to

national jurisdictions with a bump but with national PILs as the cross-border regulators.

- Under UNCLOS we have an international mirror of the domestic Separation of Powers into the Legislative, Executive and Judicial arms. The Assembly is joined by the International Seabed Authority as its Executive arm with the Tribunal based in Hamburg. The Internet too requires a global structure. It will attain this when power gives way to law. It already has analogously first its multistakeholder Assembly in the Internet Governance Forum with WSIS + 10 and second The IANA transition as the embryonic Executive arm though third the Judicial or Arbitration and Conciliation arm is yet to be developed further than the UDRP. The Internet manifestly required such a global framework for the separate issues tackled in the UNESCO study to be set in a working perspective. By characterizing the Internet as Common Heritage of Mankind we could get there. This 5th dimension - a truly global human dimension - would breathe new meaning into every one of the 4 UNESCO principles captured under ROAM.
- Thus the most obvious advantage of applying CHOM to ROAM lay first, in the Human Rights domain. Without CHOM this would be treated on an individualistic basis. With CHOM, Human Rights on the Internet would be enhanced as they would be recognized and treated internationally, not just at the national level. Similarly Openness would be given a more liberal interpretation if CHOM were applied to it. Access too would be more humanistic on a global scale under CHOM and thus less statist. And Multistakeholderism is reinforced by CHOM's promotion of equality before the law globally. So there were gains to be made if CHOM were applied to UNESCO's 4 ROAM principles. No doubt this should be further studied but this was why Dr. AST was introducing this 5th enriching dimension into UNESCO's narrative.
- It was also necessary to introduce CHOM into the other UN Agencies' pioneering work on the Internet. There was a dire lack of Policy Cohesion within the UN family regarding the Internet. Some treated the Internet as if they were not brothers and sisters in the same UN family but cousins perhaps. Thus UNESCO's approach was far more liberal than for example the WIPO with its Internet Treaties. Similarly the UN Human Rights Council's positions taken on the Internet were light years away from those of the WTO. The ITU was definitely not a cousin, but the child was "father of the man" since it was rapidly approaching its 150th anniversary in a 70 year old organization! It was not easy to introduce crosscutting UN Policy Coherence nor easy to decide who would do it especially in the short time left to WSIS + 10 and UNGA. But it was definitely worth it and should be carried out under CHOM as the unifying factor.
- Malta enjoyed membership in different networks where the Internet as CHOM was to be advanced. First the European Union was already committed to the objective of globalizing the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority - the IANA function, not

internationalizing it to be precise, and Malta would be advocating this under CHOM. Second as an active member of the Commonwealth, Malta would be promoting more Capacity-Building on Internet Governance than it has been doing to date for the Commonwealth's large number of far flung small island States, within the CHOM dimension for advocacy. Third, amongst the Small States of the world, especially including developing small island states, introducing CHOM would be a rallying call for this new characterization of the Internet as CHOM giving each a sense of ownership and a vested interest, on the UNCLOS ' original sharing model now also in line with the post-2015 SDGs. That the Commonwealth has a majority of small states as its members would not go unnoticed in the Commonwealth Summit (CHOGM) scheduled to take place in Malta in November 2015. Malta was committed to developing further thereto its well known IG Capacity-Building both directly as well as through DiploFoundation and the Commonwealth Network - IT (COMNET-IT).

- Regarding the follow up to last year's successful NetMundial in Brazil one was impressed by Virgilio Almeida's significant contribution via his recent emphasis on strengthening the IGF, which Malta definitely supported for reasons given earlier especially with the CHOM as its over-arching dimension. His comments on strengthening National Internet Bodies are also most welcome both under CHOM and in the perspective of seeking a Global Internet Governance system. Democratizing and legalizing the global separation of powers regarding the Internet is a CHOM bonus. It was undoubtedly also time to seek the setting up of an adequate third or judicial arm and arbitration and conciliation mechanisms under CHOM as discussed earlier. The Valletta Mechanism established in the early 90s under the then Conference on Security and Co-Operation in Europe (CSCE) now OSCE, could serve us well in this regard in the digital field under CHOM instead of merely for the hard security issues it was intended for. It could also be useful to examine the CSCE's rich history of Confidence Building Measures (CBMs), which could be similarly transformed into digital CBMs under CHOM. It was indisputable that by introducing the ethical, legal concept of the Internet as CHOM we could build in a stronger protection of the public interest on the Internet in a more systematic manner and similarly be better able to contain the Global Public Bads mentioned earlier.
- This is why I am inviting you all to come to Malta to a Spring Internet Conference, Dr. AST concluded, which will advance these topics both as a research process as well as diplomatically in the relevant fora during the rest of this year. Our Spring Conference is being organized by DiploFoundation, the World Economic Forum and the Government of Malta.

*Albana Shala, Chair, International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC)*

- 
- Speaking as **chairperson** of UNESCO's intergovernmental initiative for media development, the International Programme for the Development of Communication. IPDC has a **Council** of 39 Member States elected by UNESCO's General Conference; and a **Bureau** of eight Member States that meets once a year and carefully identifies some 60 to 80 projects worth supporting out of more than 100 competitive submissions.
  - IPDC is also the cradle of the **UN Plan of Action on the Safety of Journalists and the Issue of Impunity**, which is an internationally agreed framework for **multi-stakeholder** co-operation in securing safe freedom of expression, and justice for journalists and others who are attacked for their use of free expression. For IPDC, in line with the **Universal Declaration on Human Rights**, the right to free expression applies across borders, and across media platforms. In other words, to the Internet as much as to newspapers, magazines, radio and television. And without safety, the right to free expression cannot be properly exercised. The worst attack on safety is the murder of journalists. At each IPDC Council, the **UNESCO Director-General reports** on the killings of journalists and the status of judicial follow up by the UNESCO Member States where killings took place. This mechanism helps to highlight the issues and it covers not just traditional media platforms, but **also covers online and social media producers** who do journalism.
  - The recent attacks in Paris and Copenhagen highlight that attacks on the people who do journalism are a problem for the whole world, and that there is a **particular need for solidarity** with places where intolerance and impunity are high, and where journalists have little prospect for protection – both physical and digital.
  - The forthcoming IPDC Bureau meeting on 27 March will **host a debate about protection of journalists**, emphasizing that, in a global world, to stop journalists being killed anywhere, it is necessary to stop the attacks everywhere. There should be no space for “precedents” and copycat killings; instead journalists in all countries need to be protected, and perpetrators of attacks must be brought to justice everywhere.
  - The topics that we will discuss at this upcoming IPDC Bureau meeting include the protection of journalists at three levels: the **state's duties, newsroom policies and media employers' obligations, and individual capacities**, and there will be attention to digital protection as well as physical protection. You are all welcome to attend this IPDC Bureau meeting, details of which are on the UNESCO website.
  - All these issues of safety covered by IPDC are of direct relevance to this Internet study. IPDC has further served as a platform to **discuss other Internet-related**

**issues** as a contribution to this study. Most recently has been our Council meeting here in Paris last November where five experts addressed UNESCO Member States about online **privacy** and freedom of expression. Several of them are here at this conference to continue their contribution.

- Significantly, IPDC was born in 1980, as a response to what was then a debate about international imbalances in the free flow of information. Over the years, it has sought to build capacity for free, pluralistic and independent media, and for journalism safety, within developing countries. While these issues remain critical, today with the mainstreaming of the Internet in our lives, the international issue has made a comeback – this time highlighting even more complex international questions of **access, digital free expression, privacy and ethics**. Hence IPDC welcomes this draft study, and looks forward to the debate at this conference, which will help, inform our thinking going forward.
- The consultative character of the new Internet study has produced a number of **possible options** for UNESCO Member States to consider as regards the Organization's stance on Internet issues, and not least for how UNESCO can contribute to achieving the **Sustainable Development Goals**. Eventually, UNESCO's governing body, the General Conference, will decide on the way ahead. IPDC will be there as an integral part of this Organization, to make its unique contribution to following up.

## Intervention of Panelists not listed in the Initial Agenda

*Gloria Cadillo, Peru Government \**

- Peru realities:
  - 2/3 of the homes don't have access and just 5% from rural;
  - Peru's approach: Peru has a global approach to access to foster freedom of expression and human rights, without interfering with Privacy;
  - Peru's policies: Broadband effort to connect 92% and reduce prices in 90%;
  - Peru is one of the few countries that respect NN in the law level
- For Peru, access to information and knowledge is a keystone and basis to foster an inclusive knowledge society.
- For Peru, Unesco could support the implementation of recommendations presented in the Conference note and specifically could constitute an policy observatory, which is multi stakeholder.

*Gundegmaa Jargasaikhan – Mongolia, Hosting and chair of FoC in May, 2015<sup>†</sup>*

- Reported on 2015 Freedom Online Coalition Meeting, which aims at maximize and consolidate human rights online. More information at <https://www.freedomonlinecoalition.com/news/freedom-online-conference-to-be-held-in-ulaanbaatar-on-4-5-may-2015/>
- Governments affect the availability, use, and utility of the Internet in many ways – whether through action or inaction. Many developing countries are in the process of working through how to approach various aspects of Internet policy-making, and many middle-income and developed countries are constantly revising and reformulating their policies in response to technological and other developments. The 2015 Freedom Online Conference, hosted by the Government of Mongolia, will focus on discussing ways in which governments around the world, including young democracies and countries in the developing world, can structure their policy making processes and approaches in order to maximize the realization

---

\* Note: These are my free notes, since I have not received the digital version of her speech

† N Note: These are my free notes, since I have not received the digital version of her speech

of human rights online within their jurisdiction. Panels and discussions will focus on issues such as rule-of-law, transparency, the Tallinn

### **Contributions from the audience:**

*Lionel Veer, Ambassador at UNESCO, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Netherlands*

- Compliment UNESCO for its inclusive approach to involve a large number of stakeholders and great that inputs from different kinds of stakeholders have been received (convening power!) - The UN family should focus more on the resp. mandates and the division of labor of the different bodies and organizations, enhance policy coherence and focus more on complementarity (and we as member states should do the same).
- NL would like to emphasize that UNESCO should focus on its core mandate. UNESCO's strength lies in the fact that it is a standard and norm setting agency; functions/roles we see for UNESCO are awareness raising, helping stragglers, assisting in empowerment (of the users of the internet) focusing on capacity building and disseminate good/best practices.
- Important to push ROAM as the global, fundamental guiding principles for internet governance. Good result if Unesco General Conference in November accepts ROAM as first global guiding principle !!
- Furthermore, as the "think tank" of the UN Family, UNESCO should play a more prominent and reflective role in addressing issues that are perceived as "sensitive" and agenda setting. - For instance for legal issues, there are other bodies in the UN Family like the Human Rights Council and the treaty bodies that can serve for these needs.
- NL is of the opinion that there is no need to create a new convention: all rights that are available offline are online available as well. There is no comparative advantage in creating a new mechanism.
- I also would like to raise some attention to the upcoming Global Conference on Cyberspace that takes place in The Hague at 16-17 April. We want to support practical cooperation in the field of cyberspace by promoting capacity building and knowledge exchange in cyberspace: Discuss norms for responsible behavior in cyberspace, we want to promote international discussion on human rights and privacy on the internet.



- Our approach will be pragmatic and aimed at achieving solutions by building effective coalitions.
- We will aim for practical solutions to real and urgent challenges All those who have a stake in cyberspace (must be able to) participate. For more info, check website of the GCCS.
- In our view there is a false divide between Access, FoE, Privacy and Ethics: issues are inter-related and should be viewed as such. FoE needs protection, not restriction!!! Link to remarks IPDC chair on safety of journalist and fight against impunity. Important responsibility for UNESCO!

## Questions from the Audience

**1)** Richard Hill asks US Christopher Painter

*How to reconcile the role of state in cyberspace? States don't play the exclusive role and, in many moments, are not the prevalent player. How to reconcile right to privacy and US surveillance programs?*

US representative answers: US is doing a lot of work on reconciliation those both concerns. We are also working on transparency and consulting stakeholder in policy development. Surveillance is not used to curtails peoples right to expression, gender expression, etc

**2)** Sidra Iqbal, TV journalist with state TV in Pakistan PTV News + ICANN 52 Fellow asks: *There are two aspects of Internet Governance; Governance of the Internet and Governance on the Internet. The former focuses on mainly technical issues to keep Internet stable, secure and interoperable. This is often backed by the business community to be stronger in advocacy. The latter, Governance on Internet deals with matters much deeper, complex and diverse such as privacy, access, free speech and ethics. needless to add these very subject have a great importance outside the cyberspace domain. Example being of free speech and safety of journalists. Its the protection all governments should work towards but the situation is further aggravated with technology coming in equation. Example of Shahzad Saleem Journalist from Pakistan, who was abducted and killed after his data and info sources were hacked into. What is the roadmap for engaging and advocating governments to put an effective policy framework on the governance on Internet as our (minus technology advocacy on the same subjects has had its fair share of roadblocks).*

Panel Moderator Answers: comments that UNESCO should play a strong dialogue in-house and in collaboration with others. That we should also focus on how people can be trained and brought to the table.