

April 2024

Internet Society - Brazil Chapter

Contribution to the NetMundial +10 Consultation



Internet Society
Capítulo Brasil

Internet Society - Brazil Chapter Contribution to the NetMundial +10 Consultation

This document was developed by

Internet Society - Brazil Chapter

Contributors

Thobias Prado Moura, Pedro Perdigão Lana, Dina Santana Santos, Milena Cramar Lôndero, Flávio Rech Wagner

Proofreaders

Raquel Fortes Gatto, Pedro Perdigão Lana, Thobias Prado Moura, André Lucas Fernandes



Table of Contents

Table of Contents..... 1

Abstract..... 2

Introduction and Objectives..... 3

Questions..... 4

I. Principles for Internet Governance Processes..... 4

A) THE 2014 NETMUNDIAL PROCESS PRINCIPLES..... 4

B) STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITIES..... 7

C) COORDINATION..... 11

II - GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MULTISTAKEHOLDER MECHANISMS..... 14

A) PARTICIPATION IN MULTILATERAL PROCESSES..... 14

B) GUIDELINES FOR MULTISTAKEHOLDER CONSENSUS-BUILDING AND DECISION-MAKING..... 17

III - INPUT TO ONGOING PROCESSES..... 20

A) THE INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM – IGF..... 20

B) OTHER PROCESSES (GDC, WSIS+20 Review)..... 22

Abstract

This document is a response to the NetMundial +10 Consultation by Internet Society - Brazil - Chapter. The call for collaborative and multistakeholder internet governance resonates strongly, emphasizing the inclusion of governments, the private sector, civil society, and the technical community. While the principles established at NetMundial 2014 provide a solid foundation, they require adaptation to address contemporary challenges such as digital sovereignty, the rise of artificial intelligence, and concerns surrounding surveillance.

To effectively navigate these complexities, strengthening the multistakeholder approach is crucial. This involves ensuring equitable participation from all stakeholder groups and preventing the dominance of any single entity. By fostering diverse perspectives and inclusive decision-making, we can create a more balanced and representative internet governance ecosystem. However, fragmentation within the internet governance landscape poses a significant obstacle.

The proliferation of forums, initiatives, and decision-making processes can lead to duplication of efforts, conflicting approaches, and a weakening of collective action. To overcome this challenge, improving communication and coordination between these various entities is essential. Strengthening existing institutions like the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) plays a vital role in this process. By providing a platform for open dialogue and consensus-building, the IGF can facilitate greater collaboration and information exchange among stakeholders.

Additionally, encouraging regional initiatives, such as the 'Fórum Lusófono da Internet', can foster local solutions and diverse perspectives. Furthermore, enhancing the participation of non-governmental actors in multilateral processes is crucial. This involves developing clear guidelines for consensus-building and decision-making that uphold the principles of mutual respect, equity, adaptability, and sustainability.

Capacity building initiatives are also essential to equip stakeholders with the necessary skills and knowledge for effective engagement. Therefore, it is recommended to bolster the IGF's capacity to coordinate debates and address fragmentation. Sending clear messages to ongoing processes like the Global Digital Compact (GDC) and the WSIS+20 review, advocating for multistakeholder engagement, integration with the IGF, capacity building, human rights

protection, and concrete action plans is equally important. Similar efforts should be extended to other relevant platforms such as the WIC and the Wuzhen Summit.

Ultimately, the key messages of multistakeholder participation, collaboration and coordination, capacity building, concrete action, and the protection of human rights and internet principles should guide our collective efforts. Drawing inspiration from positive examples like CGI.br, the IGF, the Fórum Lusófono da Internet, and the ICANN NextGen and Fellowship programs, we can strive towards building an inclusive, open, secure, and sustainable internet governance framework that reflects the diversity of perspectives and upholds the core values of the internet.

Introduction and Objectives

The NETmundial+10 consultation is seeking inputs from various stakeholders to enhance and implement multistakeholder approaches in Internet governance. This initiative is aimed at reaffirming the commitment to the NETmundial Internet Governance Process Principles, which were formulated in 2014, and to discuss their application in the current digital scenario.

In addition, there is a desire to promote the progress and execution of the multistakeholder approach for comprehensive governance of the digital realm. This includes addressing challenges such as the rapid pace of digitization, disparities in power distribution, and limitations in governance. By reinforcing discussions on mechanisms and structures, the consultation aims to enhance multistakeholder approaches and protocols for making decisions in the digital governance field. This inclusive process seeks to achieve agreement among diverse communities and decision-making forums.

In pursuit of its goals, the NETmundial+10 consultation complements existing consultation processes by focusing on concrete political commitments and messages regarding the multistakeholder approach.

Through this contribution, the Internet Society - Brazil Chapter seeks to actively participate in shaping the future of the digital world, ensuring it remains a space for innovation, collaboration, and empowerment for all.

The 2014 NETmundial Principles remain relevant but require expansion to address emerging challenges like digital sovereignty, AI, and surveillance. The multistakeholder approach is crucial, but its implementation needs improvement to ensure equitable participation and prevent dominance by any single stakeholder group. Trust and collaboration are essential for a healthy Internet Governance ecosystem. The Internet's core principles of openness, decentralization, and innovation (Internet Way of Networking) should be preserved and promoted.

Fragmentation within the Internet Governance landscape is a major concern, requiring better communication, coordination, and shared best practices across various forums and initiatives. Strengthening existing institutions like the IGF is crucial, alongside exploring innovative approaches to bridge the gap between discussions and action. Regional and local initiatives like the Fórum Lusófono da Internet exemplify the power of collaboration and should be encouraged.

ISOC - Brazil Chapter emphasizes the need for consistent application of the multistakeholder approach, integration with the IGF, capacity building, upholding human rights, and translating high-level principles into concrete action plans. The Chapter advocates for reaffirming the multistakeholder approach, highlighting successful local collaborations, strengthening existing coordinating mechanisms, and addressing the digital divide and space fragmentation concerns, specially in new decision making processes like Global Digital Compact and Wuzhen Summit.

Questions

I. Principles for Internet Governance Processes

A) THE 2014 NETMUNDIAL PROCESS PRINCIPLES

1. The 2014 NETmundial meeting adopted a set of 10 Principles for Internet Governance Processes. In light of the rapid technical, social, and economic evolutions that have taken place since then, please indicate below your degree of support for the following statements:

The 10 "NETmundial Internet Governance Process Principles" adopted in 2014 remain relevant

to address today's digital governance challenges

Strongly agree **Agree** **Neutral** **Disagree** **Strongly disagree** **I don't know / I'd rather not respond**

Our persistent difficulties in dealing with digital issues largely stem from insufficient inclusion of all relevant stakeholders in policy discussions

Strongly agree **Agree** **Neutral** **Disagree** **Strongly disagree** **I don't know / I'd rather not respond**

Our persistent difficulties in dealing with digital issues reflect different interests, priorities and value systems of distinct stakeholders

Strongly agree **Agree** **Neutral** **Disagree** **Strongly disagree** **I don't know / I'd rather not respond**

Disclaimer: While it is true that the difficulties in Internet governance largely stem from the divergence between the interests, priorities, and value systems of different stakeholders, this is not necessarily a problem in itself. The diversity of perspectives is, in fact, a valuable characteristic of the Internet ecosystem, enriching the debate and leading to more comprehensive solutions. The real challenge lies in the lack of efficient mechanisms to deal with these divergences in a constructive way. The absence of such mechanisms can lead to distrust, polarization, and the withdrawal of certain stakeholders from the process, compromising the legitimacy and effectiveness of Internet governance. Therefore, the focus should be on improving conflict resolution and consensus-building mechanisms, ensuring that the diversity of perspectives is considered fairly and equitably, without paralyzing the decision-making process.

2. After reviewing the set of Principles for Internet Governance Processes from NETmundial 2014, do you think they need to be supplemented, in order to guide the development of the governance of the digital world? Please detail.

The principles established remain essential for Internet governance, but the rapid evolution of the digital world demands that we build upon this foundation to address emerging challenges. While the core values remain essential, we must delve deeper into specific concerns such as digital sovereignty, the risks associated with technological advancements like AI, and the ever-present issue of excessive surveillance.

It is important to acknowledge that nations have a legitimate desire to control their digital landscapes, but this should not lead to the fragmentation of the internet. We must uphold the global nature of the internet as a shared resource and public good. Additionally, the issue of excessive surveillance poses a significant threat to privacy and other fundamental rights. We must reaffirm the right to privacy as enshrined in international human rights law and actively protect it in the digital realm. This requires clear limitations and safeguards on government and private sector surveillance practices, ensuring they are demonstrably necessary, proportionate, and subject to independent oversight.

In 2022, several countries have experienced internet shutdowns that overlap with significant events, such as elections. These shutdowns are often justified by national security, hate speech or disinformation alleged threats. However, these actions have raised significant concerns about the abuse of digital sovereignty to suppress dissent and control information flow, which undermines the fundamental principles of an open and accessible internet.

Moreover, the rise of strict digital borders and the use of digital sovereignty, as exemplified by initiatives like the Great Firewall of China and Russia's RuNet, along with similar trends in the West, contribute to the alarming trend of a fragmented internet, commonly known as the "splinternet."

Finally, the rise of technologies like AI presents immense opportunities and potential risks. Embedding human rights and ethical considerations into the development and deployment of AI is essential to prevent discrimination, bias, and other harms. Collaboration and knowledge-sharing among diverse stakeholders, including researchers, developers, policymakers, and civil society, can foster responsible innovation and ensure that AI serves the

greater good.

Regulations concerning digital sovereignty must be handled carefully, avoiding a one-size-fits-all approach that could hinder comprehension. It is important to acknowledge the various policies contributing to digital sovereignty while balancing foundational Internet principles and other regulatory objectives, such as security, user rights, fair competition, privacy, disinformation mitigation, and human rights preservation. This will lead to a better understanding of the issue and ensure that all aspects are taken into account.

To address these challenges, we recommend:

- Fostering open and inclusive dialogues among diverse stakeholders to address emerging challenges collaboratively
- Establishing clear ethical guidelines and principles for the development and deployment of new technologies, ensuring they are aligned with human rights, promote social good, and avoid perpetuating bias or discrimination
- Encouraging the adoption of open standards and interoperable technologies to prevent fragmentation of the internet and maintain its global reach.
- Supporting capacity building initiatives in developing countries to enable them to participate meaningfully in shaping the digital landscape and assert their digital sovereignty in a responsible manner.
- Ensuring that national policies and regulations related to digital sovereignty adhere to international human rights law and do not unduly restrict fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of expression and access to information.

B) STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITIES

3. The 2014 NETmundial statement includes the following “multistakeholder” Internet Governance Process Principle: *“The respective roles and responsibilities of*

stakeholders should be interpreted in a flexible manner with reference to the issue under discussion. The distribution of roles and responsibilities between stakeholders is an ongoing (and contentious) subject of debate. In this regard, please indicate below your degree of support for the following statements:

Each stakeholder group has different roles and responsibilities, depending on the topic and phases of specific governance processes

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree I don't know / I'd rather not respond

Most digital governance processes are applying the above mentioned "multistakeholder" principle

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree I don't know / I'd rather not respond

Disclaimer: The statement was understood as referring to "digital governance processes" in a broad sense, without specifying whether it refers to traditional Internet governance or broader processes such as the Global Digital Compact (GDC). This leaves room for interpretation. In this context, most classic Internet governance mechanisms do apply some level of multistakeholderism, as was the focus of NETmundial 2014. The problem is that the current digital governance landscape is much broader and more complex, including several processes and forums where multistakeholder participation is still limited or incipient.

4. Do you see room for improvements in the implementation of the above mentioned "multistakeholder" principle? If yes, what would you suggest?

The Tunis Conference discussed a first draft of the multistakeholder principle in Internet Governance. At that time, a set of responsibilities and attributions was fluidly and overlapping delimited among the actors in the Internet Governance space. However, beyond the fact that

the Tunis Conference was not a multistakeholder space but rather multilateral, the discussion becomes even more complex when starting from the premise that the definition established within the framework of the Tunis Conference only represents some possible combinations of stakeholders. It also does not define a closed concept of a multistakeholder approach, but acknowledges different ways of viewing it. Thus, there is perceived to be a broader tension between the need to adapt to the complex realities of the Internet Governance ecosystem and the preservation of the fundamental principles that have shaped the Internet over the past thirty years.

In 2014, the NetMundial Declaration established a definition for the 'multistakeholder approach', which was agreed upon by consensus and accurately reflected the challenges of that time. It is pertinent to note that this definition is not rigid or closed, and that different institutions or processes may modify who the responsible actors are, depending on their institutional reality. Given the constantly evolving nature of the understanding of what 'multistakeholder approach' entails, this definition serves as a helpful guide for multistakeholder governance institutions and processes. Multistakeholderism is a practice of applying the principles of Internet Governance to decisions. It must work not based on one or two groups but on all its actors. Thus, it means taking advantage of each stakeholder's experience and competencies. But, it cannot be treated uniformly as it may vary depending on the political entity and institutional processes.

Flexibility in Internet Governance is undoubtedly essential as the digital landscape continuously evolves. However, this adaptability should never come at the cost of empowering one stakeholder group over others. It's crucial to actively resist models that prioritize either governmental or private sector solutions, including when this happens through keeping the status quo due to ineffective decision-making processes, as they inherently undermine the core principles of multistakeholderism.

While potentially efficient, government-centric approaches risk imposing regulations that stifle online freedoms and innovation and neglect citizens' diverse needs and rights. Similarly, private sector dominance can prioritize profits over public good and fundamental rights, leading to data privacy concerns, unequal access for marginalized communities, huge socio-economic gaps, an untrustworthy Internet, and an unhealthy concentration of power among large corporations.

The strength of multistakeholderism lies in its collaborative spirit, fostering cooperation and consensus-building among diverse voices, where all parties act together to share their

expertise, perspectives, and concerns. This ensures equitable and sustainable solutions, unlike top-down approaches that can stifle innovation and limit participation. Moreover, closed-door decision-making, whether dominated by governments or private companies, creates a breeding ground for a lack of transparency and accountability, increasing the risk of corruption and unfair practices. On the other hand, multistakeholder models promote open dialogue and scrutiny, ensuring all stakeholders have a voice and can hold each other accountable.

Although there have been increasing discussions regarding the typology of stakeholder classes, particularly within policy-making processes, as seen with the Global Digital Compact (GDC). Additionally, there is also a dangerous attempt to shift towards the traditional “tripartite” model, where the technical community is included under the broader umbrella of civil society.

To discuss changes to the multistakeholder approach, it is important to consider the Internet ecosystem's ability to remain functional and coherent. There is a functional self-awareness that distinguishes each stakeholder, as well as an internal logic composed of actors who contribute to its operations. Although actors have specific goals, they all (or at least most) share the common objective of maintaining the Internet as a globally connected, open, and secure resource.

The question that needs to be addressed is how Internet Governance can evolve to accommodate these diverse actors without compromising the principles that guide the multistakeholder model and have supported the Internet's growth and stability thus far.

While some global models, such as ICANN, are often lauded as successful examples of multistakeholder governance, it's essential to acknowledge a certain degree of bias toward actors from developed countries historically at the center of Internet development.

That's why CGI (Brazilian Internet Steering Committee) stands out as a prime example due to its commitment to diversity and its bottom-up approach. Its inclusive structure fosters greater participation from various stakeholders, including those often marginalized in global discussions. The CGI's success demonstrates that effective multistakeholder models can flourish and guarantee positive returns to society beyond the traditional power centers of the developed world.

From the outset, the Internet was intended to be managed, developed, and governed collaboratively and in a decentralized way. These principles are outlined in the NETmundial

Multistakeholder Statement and other documents, such as the Internet Way of Networking developed by the Internet Society. To accomplish this, the community must have mutual trust and recognition. Trust reduces complexity within decision-making processes, ensuring that the Internet operates interoperably and globally connectedly. Recently, there has been a crisis of trust in collaborative and collective international processes, including those related to Internet Governance.

We believe building trust among the community members is essential for working together to create a better Internet. It is crucial to involve the youth community in every stage of the process to ensure our voices are heard and their opinions are taken into account.

The involvement of younger generations is critical for the long-term sustainability and legitimacy of multistakeholder models in Internet governance. Consequently, it is imperative to establish dedicated "Youth Tracks" and initiatives that empower young individuals. Programs such as ICANN NextGen and ICANN Fellowship exemplify this dedication to youth engagement.

NextGen@ICANN provides young individuals a platform to learn about Internet governance, network with experts, and participate in ICANN meetings. The Fellowship program offers in-depth training and mentorship to aspiring leaders from developing countries, equipping them with the necessary skills and knowledge to make meaningful contributions to Internet governance processes. These initiatives not only ensure a diversity of perspectives but also cultivate the next generation of Internet governance leaders.

Nevertheless, this increased involvement should come with higher expectations for responsibility and accountability. Recognizing them as equally essential actors means that their behavior should be held to the same standards as any other participant, avoiding more lenient perspectives due to less experience.

Consequently, establishing dedicated "Youth Tracks" and initiatives like ICANN NextGen and ICANN Fellowship is imperative. Ultimately, these programs cultivate the next generation of Internet governance leaders, ensuring the long-term sustainability and legitimacy of multistakeholder models.

C) COORDINATION

5. Numerous initiatives and processes have emerged to address the broad diversity of issues raised by the digital revolution. Sometimes, multiple processes address the same issues in parallel. Please indicate below your degree of support for the following statements:

Separate siloed discussions on a specific issue risk creating incompatible and even conflicting outcomes

Strongly agree **Agree** **Neutral** **Disagree** **Strongly disagree** **I don't know / I'd rather not respond**

Disclaimer: Our position is based on the premise that internal debates and constructions within communities and institutions are essential. However, the problem arises when decision-making and deliberation spaces are created in an isolated and fragmented manner, as already described in the PNIF, without proper coordination and dialogue with other relevant actors and forums. An example of this would be separating the discussion and deliberation on new spaces for discussion and deliberation on Artificial Intelligence (AI) outside the multistakeholder spaces of Internet governance, under the justification that AI is a new technology that requires its own decision-making space. This approach ignores the interconnection between AI and other Internet governance issues, such as privacy, security, and human rights, and can lead to conflicting and incoherent results. Similarly, the initial idea of the Global Digital Compact (GDC) to create a new space that would replace the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) also represents a risk of fragmentation and duplication of efforts. Therefore, we defend the importance of maintaining and valuing existing Internet governance spaces and mechanisms, promoting coordination and dialogue between them, rather than creating new isolated forums. This approach is essential to ensure the coherence, legitimacy, and effectiveness of the policies and regulations that shape the digital future.

Distributed initiatives on a particular issue can help cover the diversity of approaches and perspectives

Strongly agree **Agree** **Neutral** **Disagree** **Strongly disagree** **I don't know / I'd rather not respond**

Better coordination is needed between processes dealing with overlapping issues

Strongly agree **Agree** **Neutral** **Disagree** **Strongly disagree** **I don't know / I'd rather not respond**

6. If you believe better coordination is needed, please suggest ways to do so and specific text or language that could be included as recommendations in a NETmundial+10 outcome statement.

When addressing overlapping problems, it is crucial to recognize their interconnected nature. An intersectional methodology is necessary for effective solutions, acknowledging that diverse issues work in an intertwined manner. Then, it is essential to avoid universalizing concepts that overlook community-specific nuances, particularly between the Global South and Global North.

In Internet Governance, diverse stakeholders contribute varied perspectives, but the efforts must prioritize achieving consensus. It is necessary to organize and manage the participation of actors who implement the discussions raised in the events, such as telecommunications operators, Internet providers, among others. The involvement of technical experts alongside government and civil society ensures balanced decision-making.

In addition, the current state of Internet governance faces a critical challenge: fragmentation. This also happens in the public debate arena. The ever-increasing number of discussions, initiatives, and decision-making spaces leads to information overload, hindering productive collaboration and ultimately weakening the multistakeholder model. To tackle this problem, better communication and collaboration are vital.

This involves facilitating dialogue between communities, sharing best practices and promoting joint initiatives. Also, developing mechanisms for coordinating policy development would ensure coherence and consistency across different IG forums and initiatives, preventing conflicting approaches and duplication of efforts.

Regular cross-community dialogues would further encourage open communication and the exchange of ideas between different Internet Governance bodies and initiatives.

Additionally, establishing a common repository of best practices would allow for the sharing of

successful strategies and approaches to multistakeholder collaboration and Internet Governance challenges.

Furthermore, fostering collaboration and joint initiatives is equally important. Identifying areas of common interest and potential synergy can lead to the development of joint projects and initiatives between different stakeholder groups. Developing mechanisms for coordinating policy development would ensure coherence and consistency across different Internet Governance forums and initiatives, preventing conflicting approaches and duplication of efforts.

Moreover, promoting cross-participation in key events and discussions would encourage stakeholders to actively engage in Internet Governance processes beyond their immediate areas of expertise, leading to a more holistic understanding of the challenges and opportunities at hand. Strengthening existing institutions like the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) is crucial. Empowering the IGF with a stronger mandate and resources, improving its follow-up mechanisms, and bolstering regional and national IGFs will enhance its ability to tackle fragmentation at all levels.

In this sense, there are concerns about the creation of new gTLDs as well as the best way to promote DNSSEC adoption will ensure the stability and security of the Internet's core infrastructure. Collaborative efforts between Regional Internet Registries to accelerate IPv6 deployment and address routing security issues are equally important. In addition to refining existing institutions, creating new mechanisms may be necessary, always looking to avoid the fragmentation of governance spaces.

Finally, establishing funding mechanisms to support research, capacity building, and initiatives addressing fragmentation would provide the necessary resources for sustained progress.

II - GUIDELINES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MULTISTAKEHOLDER MECHANISMS

There is broad consensus to support the multistakeholder approach, but little common or broadly-shared understanding about how to put it into practice. NETmundial+10 aims to help operationalize, through guidelines, principles and mechanisms, improvements for multistakeholder collaboration.

A) PARTICIPATION IN MULTILATERAL PROCESSES

7. Some multilateral processes offer the possibility for non-governmental stakeholders to contribute through consultations. However, these examples remain limited and there is often no transparency on how these inputs are taken into account in subsequent stages of discussions among States. Please indicate below your degree of support for the following statements:

Since NETmundial 2014, opportunities for non-governmental stakeholders to participate in multilateral processes have been improved

Disclaimer: While some multilateral processes have become more participatory since 2014, the essence of "closed doors" still prevails in many cases. Processes such as the development of the Global Digital Compact (GDC), for example, demonstrate that the effective participation and influence of non-governmental stakeholders in negotiations and decision-making remains a challenge. Therefore, it is necessary to reflect on the need for more significant advances in the openness and inclusion of multilateral processes, ensuring that the voices of civil society, the technical community, and the private sector are heard and considered effectively.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree I don't know / I'd rather not respond

More transparent mechanisms should be put in place regarding how input from non-governmental stakeholders is taken into account

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree I don't know / I'd rather not respond

Relevant non-governmental stakeholders should be able to attend/observe multilateral negotiations on digital issues

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree I don't know / I'd rather not respond

Relevant non-governmental stakeholders should be able to contribute in a meaningful way to multilateral negotiations on digital issues

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree I don't know / I'd rather not respond

8. Please suggest ways to improve meaningful participation of non-governmental stakeholders in multilateral processes and add specific text or language in that regard that could be included as recommendations in a NETmundial+10 outcome statement. If possible, please indicate examples you know of meaningful participation of stakeholders in multilateral-driven processes.

To truly harness the Internet's potential for global good, we must move beyond fragmented governance structures and embrace a future where all stakeholders have a voice. Meaningful participation of non-governmental actors in multilateral processes is a necessity, to avoid strong claims of sovereignty that may break the Internet as we know it.

This requires a concerted effort to formalize mechanisms for stakeholder engagement. Multilateral organizations should establish dedicated multistakeholder advisory bodies with clear mandates, ensuring diverse representation and the ability to provide input on policy development and implementation. Additionally, transparent and inclusive consultation processes, coupled with resources to support stakeholder participation, are vital to overcome barriers and foster genuine engagement. Investing in capacity building and skills development is equally important.

Programs that enhance stakeholders' understanding of multilateral processes and Internet Governance issues, along with initiatives that cultivate local and regional expertise, will empower non-governmental actors to participate effectively on the global stage.

Moreover, multilateral processes must be open and accessible, with timely publication of relevant documents and clear communication channels for stakeholders to provide

feedback. Mechanisms should be established to ensure that multilateral organizations are held accountable for their actions and responsive to stakeholder concerns. Meaningful engagement can manifest in various ways, from online and offline contributions to formal and informal interactions.

Finally, learning from successful examples like the IGF, the NetMundial 2014 and the ICANN multistakeholder model is essential. The NETmundial+10 outcome statement should include clear calls to action. We must urge multilateral organizations to establish formalized mechanisms for stakeholder engagement, emphasizing inclusivity and transparency.

Governments and other stakeholders should invest in capacity building and skills development initiatives, empowering non-governmental actors to participate effectively. Transparency and accountability must be prioritized, with mechanisms for feedback and organizational accountability firmly established.

B) GUIDELINES FOR MULTISTAKEHOLDER CONSENSUS-BUILDING AND DECISION-MAKING

Principles of open and inclusive multistakeholder collaboration in digital governance are scattered in various foundational documents and declarations. The characteristics enunciated below are distilled from some of those documents that deal with multistakeholder collaboration processes as well as from current good practices and experiences.

The aim here is to obtain feedback from the community as to the relevance of each of these characteristics, with a view to elaborating a sort of “gold standard” or “protocol of protocols” that may serve national, regional, and global communities to establish and develop multistakeholder collaboration processes and mechanisms, as well as to assess processes and mechanisms that are presented as being multistakeholder.

9. Please rank the relevance of the following guidelines in the order of importance in your view. Assign a number from 1 to 12 to each item, where 1 indicates the most important and 12 indicates the least important:

[12] Multistakeholder processes should be accessible to all stakeholders, regardless of their

background, status, or level of expertise.

[7] Multistakeholder processes should empower stakeholders by providing them with the necessary information, resources, and skills to participate effectively.

[8] Stakeholders should treat each other with mutual respect, recognizing the value of diverse viewpoints and contributions.

[5] Multistakeholder processes should involve informed and deliberative discussion among stakeholders.

[11] Stakeholders should share responsibility for the outcomes of the multistakeholder process.

[3] Multistakeholder processes should be governed by the rule of law, with respect for constitutional principles, human rights, and legal frameworks.

[2] Mechanisms for resolving conflicts among stakeholders should be in place to enable decision-making.

[1] Digital governance processes should be flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances, evolving technologies, emerging issues, and changing geopolitical dynamics.

[6] Decisions should consider the long-term implications and sustainability of outcomes.

[10] Capacity-building efforts enhance understanding and skills of stakeholders, particularly those from developing countries and underrepresented communities.

[9] Multistakeholder processes should strive to treat all stakeholders fairly and equitably, considering their respective needs, capacities, and vulnerabilities.

[4] A global multistakeholder approach to digital governance should recognize the need for collaborative action across national borders and stakeholder groups.

10. Please identify up to three relevant items from the above list you consider are not being effectively implemented in current digital governance processes.

Multistakeholder processes should be accessible to all stakeholders, regardless of their background, status, or level of expertise.

Multistakeholder processes should empower stakeholders by providing them with the necessary information, resources, and skills to participate effectively.

Stakeholders should treat each other with mutual respect, recognizing the value of diverse viewpoints and contributions.

Multistakeholder processes should involve informed and deliberative discussion among stakeholders.

Stakeholders should share responsibility for the outcomes of the multistakeholder process.

Multistakeholder processes should be governed by the rule of law, with respect for constitutional principles, human rights, and legal frameworks.

Mechanisms for resolving conflicts among stakeholders should be in place to enable decision-making.

Digital governance processes should be flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances, evolving technologies, emerging issues, and changing geopolitical dynamics.

Decisions should consider the long-term implications and sustainability of outcomes.

Capacity-building efforts enhance understanding and skills of stakeholders, particularly those from developing countries and underrepresented communities.

Multistakeholder processes should strive to treat all stakeholders fairly and equitably, considering their respective needs, capacities, and vulnerabilities.

A global multistakeholder approach to digital governance should recognize the need for collaborative action across national borders and stakeholder groups.

11. Please suggest additional elements that could take part in a set of guidelines for

multistakeholder collaboration that could be included as recommendations in a NETmundial+10 outcome statement. If possible, please indicate examples you know of multistakeholder processes that stand out in your view as positive models of such collaboration.

Deepening global engagement is essential. Actively reaching out to regional and local Internet Governance initiatives, fostering dialogue, and integrating diverse perspectives from around the world will enrich the conversation. In this sense, strengthening multistakeholder collaboration is equally important.

Moving beyond mere consultation to genuine collaboration, where all stakeholders have a meaningful opportunity to contribute to discussions and decision-making processes, is key. Fostering open and transparent communication regarding the NETmundial, agendas, and outcomes builds trust among participants.

Additionally, developing mechanisms to address power imbalances and ensure the equitable representation of diverse stakeholder interests is crucial for a truly collaborative environment.

A positive example of such collaboration promoting linguistic diversity is the 1st Fórum Lusófono da Governança da Internet. As a space for dialogue among Portuguese-speaking stakeholders, it addresses Internet Governance issues relevant to the Lusophone community, demonstrating the power of regional collaboration. Learning from initiatives like this one, the NETmundial process can encourage the creation of similar spaces for dialogue and collaboration among other linguistic communities.

III - INPUT TO ONGOING PROCESSES

A) THE INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM – IGF

12. The IGF environment, including the global annual event, the National and Regional Initiatives and the intersessional work, brings together all stakeholder groups on an equal footing. Please indicate below your degree of support for the following statements regarding the IGF:

The IGF has been an effective space for Internet Governance debates and cooperation

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree I don't know
/ I'd rather not respond

The IGF lacks the required financial resources to properly perform its mission

Disclaimer: The current funding model restricts the IGF's ability to fully achieve its goals and potential. In this sense, many organizations, particularly those from underrepresented regions and marginalized communities, are unable to participate in IGF activities due to financial constraints. This lack of diversity weakens the multistakeholder approach and hinders inclusive dialogue. For the other side, the IGF faces limitations in supporting regional and national IGF initiatives (NRIs), intersessional work, and capacity building programs. This restricts the reach and impact of the IGF, hindering its ability to effectively address emerging internet governance challenges. The current funding model relies heavily on voluntary contributions, which can fluctuate and create uncertainty for long-term planning and sustainability. Therefore, it is crucial to advocate for increased and more sustainable funding for the IGF to ensure its effectiveness in promoting inclusive, multistakeholder internet governance.

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree I don't know
/ I'd rather not respond

With appropriate conditions, the IGF has the capacity to innovate multistakeholder approaches

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree I don't know
/ I'd rather not respond

A strengthened IGF would be the preferred space to improve coordination among digital governance processes

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree I don't know
/ I'd rather not respond

13. Do you believe that a strengthened IGF environment, including the NRIs and the intersessional work, could be the right place to coordinate debates on the governance of the Internet and digital issues, and thus help tackle the problem of governance fragmentation? If so, in which ways should the IGF environment be strengthened in order to fulfill this role?

Yes, the IGF is historically the main event of Internet Governance around the world, where different actors from different organizations and backgrounds come together to share what they have done or learned during the year, and debate it on equal footing, helping to build international consensus and identify risks and opportunities. However, the IGF is not a decision-making forum, but a discussion one, which means there are no solid mechanisms to try to achieve consensus and implement resolutions.

So it is important to develop structured processes within the IGF to facilitate the development of tangible outcomes besides policy recommendations, best practices, or guidelines, based on discussions and inputs from various stakeholders. These mechanisms, however, should not be extensive, to avoid a distortion of the IGF nature as essentially a discussion forum.

Ultimately, addressing the gap between discussion and action requires ongoing innovation and experimentation within the IGF framework, something that could be achieved by building closer ties with other organizations that are central to the functioning of the Internet (creating tools to deliver direct input to their internal processes), such as the ICANN, the IETF and the IEEE, but also with multilateral institutions, such as the ITU.

B) OTHER PROCESSES (GDC, WSIS+20 Review)

Several processes are under way in the UN context regarding the governance of digital issues, in particular the negotiations around the Global Digital Compact (included in the Pact for the Future) and the WSIS+20 review process. They may set fundamental guidelines and recommendations for the further development of the Internet and the digital ecosystem as a good for society and for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals – SDGs. As a unique gathering with all participant stakeholders on an equal footing, do you believe that NETmundial+10 should send messages to these processes?

14. If you think NETmundial+10 should send messages to the Global Digital Compact, please indicate below what these key messages would be.

As we approach the WSIS+20 review and the development of the Global Digital Compact, NETmundial+10 stands as a crucial voice for a unified and inclusive Internet Governance ecosystem. We must champion the multistakeholder approach, recognizing its success in maintaining the Internet's stability despite global challenges and advocating for its consistent implementation across all Internet Governance processes. This means moving beyond mere consultations and truly sharing decision-making power with non-state actors, as envisioned in the Tunis Agenda. Supporting innovative proposals, like multistakeholder drafting teams for GDC issue papers (or at least in the role of direct reviewers), demonstrates our commitment to operationalizing this shared responsibility.

The Internet Governance Forum, with its open and inclusive nature, is the natural home for discussing GDC issues and implementing its recommendations. We must encourage the integration of the GDC process with ongoing IGF improvement efforts, leveraging existing momentum and enhancing its relevance. Fragmenting the existing fora and institutions is a clear mistake that should be avoided at all costs, especially given the risk of opening up opportunities for actors who are not interested in a globally unified Internet to take part in these new spaces, since this type of fragmented movement has been consistently rejected by more traditional institutions.

Investing in capacity building and skills development for non-governmental stakeholders is crucial, as mentioned above. We must empower them to participate meaningfully in multilateral processes and contribute to informed decision-making. This involves bridging the knowledge gap, promoting local and regional expertise in Internet Governance, and utilizing technology to facilitate remote participation and overcome geographical barriers.

While high-level principles are the foundation, we must translate them into concrete action. This necessitates developing clear action plans with measurable goals, establishing a robust follow-up mechanism to ensure the GDC's continued progress beyond the 2024 summit, and encouraging the integration of its principles into national and regional digital strategies for global coherence.

Throughout these endeavors, upholding human rights and fundamental freedoms, while also preserving the technical aspects that allowed the Internet to develop as it did, remains our guiding light. Ensuring that the GDC and all Internet Governance processes protect the critical

properties of the Internet and their enablers, while also guaranteeing freedom of expression, privacy, and access to information online, is non-negotiable.

15. If you think NETmundial+10 should send messages to the WSIS+20 review process, please indicate below what these key messages would be.

- Reaffirm the crucial role of multistakeholder collaboration in Internet Governance, emphasizing the need for inclusive and meaningful participation from all stakeholder groups.
- Highlight successful examples of local multistakeholder collaboration, such as the Fórum Lusófono da Internet and other regional initiatives, demonstrating the effectiveness of this approach (instead of a deeply centralized one) in addressing Internet Governance challenges.
- Support the strengthening of existing coordinating bodies or mechanisms, such as the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), to facilitate greater collaboration and information exchange among various stakeholders.
- Advocate for strengthening mechanisms for effective multistakeholder engagement within the WSIS process, such as public comments phases and establishing observer entities (avoiding meetings without the participation by non-governmental actors).
- Emphasize the importance of addressing the digital divide and ensuring equitable access to the Internet for all, regardless of location, socioeconomic status, gender, language, or ability.
- Advocate for increased investment in digital infrastructure development, particularly in underserved regions, and the promotion of affordable access to Internet connectivity.
- Advocate for the increasing of multistakeholder dialogue and collaboration between UN and other spaces in the discussion of the Convention on Cybercrime to guarantee the protection of the Internet Way of Networking, applying the same logic to other similar

processes related to the digital environment..

- Highlight the growing concern of fragmentation within the Internet Governance landscape, where a multitude of discussions, initiatives, and decision-making spaces lead to information overload and hinder effective collaboration. Emphasize the negative impact of fragmentation in the decision-making spaces, potentially leading to duplication of efforts, conflicting approaches, and a weakening of collective action.

16. Do you think there are other processes that could benefit from the outcomes of the NETmundial+10 meeting? Please detail and indicate which key messages could be sent to those processes.

It is important to emphasize the importance of inclusive and meaningful multistakeholder participation in Internet Governance discussions, encouraging WIC and the Wuzhen Summit to broaden stakeholder engagement beyond government and private sector actors. Also, it is important to share concerns about increasing fragmentation in the Internet Governance landscape and encourage collaboration with other forums and initiatives to promote greater coordination and coherence.

For the other side, beyond simply respecting human rights, Internet Governance decision-making processes should be actively oriented towards promoting the fundamental principles and values that underpin the Internet's success: the Internet Way of Networking. This approach goes beyond mere compliance and seeks to embed the core tenets of openness, collaboration, decentralization, and innovation.

Moreover, it is important to evaluate the potential impact of proposed policies and regulations on the openness, collaboration, decentralization, and innovation of the Internet. Only reinforcing this in local, regional and global processes, Internet Governance can move beyond a reactive approach focused on mitigating harms, towards a proactive approach that fosters the Internet's positive potential. The Internet itself can serve as a paradigm and role model for collaborative, decentralized, and innovative decision-making processes in other spheres of society.