



## **ASSOCIATION FOR PROGRESSIVE COMMUNICATIONS**

### **CONTRIBUTION TO THE UN COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT FIVE YEAR REVIEW OF PROGRESS CONCERNING WSIS OUTCOMES**

#### **1. What do you consider to be the most important achievements of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) since 2005?**

- The creation of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) as a space for multi-stakeholder dialogue and debate on internet governance issues.
- Increased recognition of the value and application of the multi-stakeholder approach in dialogue and decision-making, in public policy processes that deal with internet governance and other ICT policy issues.
- Increased recognition that building a 'people centred information society' involves more than science and technology, but also social, cultural, political and economic development.
- Increased activity in regional and national processes around ICT public policies and strategies, beyond formal global WSIS spaces.

#### **2a. In what areas do you think most progress has been made in implementing WSIS outcomes at an international and regional level during the five years from 2005 to 2010?**

Four followup processes emerged from the WSIS:

- WSIS action line implementation (including action lines dealing specifically with open, affordable and universal access) - a total of 11 action lines.
- Internet Governance Forum
- Enhanced Cooperation on managing critical internet resources
- Financing ICTD/Digital Solidarity Fund

Most visible progress has been made in relation to Internet Governance through the Internet Governance Forum at regional and global levels. The process, organisation and structure of the IGF provides platforms, at these levels, for a great number of diverse stakeholders to engage, network, share information, collaborate and so on.



APC has found the IGF to be a creative and influential forum for policy dialogue. We have seen evidence of how the IGF contributes to a more integrated approach in internet governance practice through informed debate and learning. It has also contributed to an increased better understanding among participants of IG issues and how, and why, they are important to different stakeholder groups and people from different parts of the world. The IGF process of the last five years has enriched our understanding of internet public policy issues, actors, spaces and challenges. The IGF process has also contributed to several action lines, Action line C4: Capacity building, for example, though it's difficult to assess whether progress has been significant or not.

There has been dramatic increase in access. The mobile internet expansion has been a key factor to connect some parts of the world like Asia. In Africa and Latin America, access has also increased but still limited and expensive and there is a lack of national and regional backbone in those regions.

Some degree of progress has been made in relation to all action lines, but it is difficult to assess the extent of global and regional progress, in spite of mechanisms to facilitate this task, such as the annual WSIS reporting on action lines, the WSIS Stocktaking and so on.

## **2b. What action should be taken to build on this success during the next five years?**

In relation to the Internet Governance Forum:

- A more 'outcome' oriented approach. This does not imply negotiated agreements which we do not believe is the role of the IGF. However, if the IGF can distil messages, or suggestions for further discussion, or even concrete advice, it will facilitate follow up interaction between stakeholders and it could consolidate and elevate its impact.
- Increased participation from developing countries. This requires the investment of effort many actors, including developing country governments. It also requires a more effective means of supporting participation of stakeholders from developing country governments and increased efforts to build their capacities.
- Increased support for regional, national and thematic IGF's.
- Shifting from 'remote' participation to 'enhanced' participation to enable more distributed and diverse involvement of different stakeholders in both the process of setting the WSIS forum agenda and the debate during the event itself.
- A budget for inviting speakers for main sessions so that their selection is based on expertise rather than on 'they are attending already'.

## **3a. In what areas do you think least progress has been made in implementing WSIS outcomes at an international and regional level during these five years?**

- Lack of substantial progress on enhanced cooperation for global coordination of internet resources and public policies
- Financing ICT4D and effective inclusion of developing country actors in global internet public policy processes. Many governments in developing countries are not allocating resources to ICT4D in a consistent manner.
- The policy environment is still not sufficiently enabling for the developing of a free, open and fair internet and competitive ICT sector. In many countries, there are still challenges with ensuring that regulation takes place effectively in the public interest. Many regulators still influenced by governments, or by large and powerful interests, particularly large mobile operators and multinational operators.
- Implementation of WSIS Action Lines.

- Linking internet public policy with human rights and with social, cultural and economic development concerns.
- Development of a facilitated and supported process for stakeholders to implement the use of indicators that can be used to measure the social, economic and cultural impacts of WSIS implementation.

### **3b. What action should be taken to address these challenges during the next five years?**

#### **Process**

The WSIS Action line implementation and follow process needs significant reform if it is to become a more constructive platform for shared learning, collaboration, networking and monitoring of the Geneva Action Plan and Tunis Agenda.

Processes should be:

- participatory – for example, by putting clear mechanisms in place for the effective engagement and inclusion of all the interested parties, particularly of developing countries actors in way that allow to fully integrate the multi-stakeholder approach in WSIS follow up and implementation at all levels;
- proactive - for example, by coordinating initiatives across agencies and stakeholder communities;
- analytical - for example, by addressing a small number of specific issues in detail;
- evaluative - for example, by monitoring activity related to WSIS outcomes;
- informative - for example, by facilitating exchange of information between participant

Appropriate methodologies (in on and offline meeting spaces) need to be in place to facilitate each of these different needs.

Some additional actions in terms of improving the WSIS implementation and followup process that could be pursued include:

- establishment of a multi-stakeholder advisory group to assist the CSTD chair and secretariat in designing its work programme, and to help prepare for the annual and inter-sessional meetings on 'information society' issues.
- Production of integrated national reports by facilitating agencies and commissions, , with the involvement of all stakeholders, but particularly CSOs, enabling more bottom-up monitoring by citizens and non-governmental entities thereby strengthening accountability, good governance and multi-stakeholder participation. This process would contribute to addressing the lack of systematic reports of follow-up and implementation at national level in both the WSIS Action Line and CSTD processes.
- Future action and reports that focus specifically on barriers and challenges that limit successful implementation, and suggest ways in which they can be overcome
- preparation of progress reports by national governments prior to WSIS follow up events in Geneva. Such reports could use a common template, and include sections on the WSIS principles and other important priorities that were agreed on in during the WSIS, such as the importance of human rights in the information society. The production, discussion and review of these reports could form the basis of national multi-stakeholder consultations on WSIS follow up and implementation. National follow up forums can help to address the high cost of Geneva face-to-face meetings mentioned in the SG's report. They can also serve to point to the need for specific capacity development at the level of national institutions who can influence effective follow up and implementation, for example, parliaments, regulators, consumer groups, industry and civil society networks. They could also facilitate a more effective use of delegates time at global follow up

processes.

## Content

In terms of content, the development of universal affordable broadband infrastructure and the impact of sustainable energy use have to be considered; and that policy and regulation need to be formulated from a human rights based approach, ensuring protection of privacy and other rights of people in the internet, ensuring neutrality of the network and promoting community driven initiatives.

Specifically, in the areas related to question 3a, the following aspects should be considered:

- Lack of substantial progress on enhanced cooperation for global coordination of internet resources and public policies
  - whilst recognizing that some steps have been taken towards Enhanced Cooperation, much remains to be done. It is imperative that this deficit continue to be addressed through existing institutions, and where appropriate through new institutional developments that comply with the accepted process criteria of being open, accountable, transparent, democratic and inclusive.
  - enhanced cooperation should encompass all Internet-related public policy issues;
  - existing arrangements of relevant organisations (including the Internet Governance Forum) should fully implement enhanced cooperation
  - whatever new arrangements may be put in place, civil society must play an integral part in them, as one of the prerequisites for their legitimacy.
- Financing ICT4D and effective inclusion of developing country actors in global internet public policy processes
  - In addressing the question of financial mechanisms for meeting the challenges of ICT for Development, APC feels that funding is needed to address a number of 'overarching' activities in order to get the best value out of investment in infrastructure development.
  - *An ICT finance research agenda* – this includes research into ICT supply and demand in changing markets in order to focus investment more effectively, research into business models for public private partnerships to ensure they are developed, implemented and governed in the public interest, research into business models that ensure open access and affordability in different contexts and research that reviews the role of Universal Service Funds and Universal Service Obligations.
- The policy environment is still not sufficiently enabling for the developing of a free, open and fair internet and competitive ICT sector. In many countries, there are still challenges with ensuring that regulation takes place effectively in the public interest. Many regulators still influenced by governments, or by large and powerful interests, particularly large mobile operators and multinational operators.
  - *The development of policy coherence* between different policies and plans related to infrastructure development, e.g. national and regional broadband, spectrum policy in the context of increasing reliance of wireless infrastructure. One way of addressing this would be support for regional Communications Policy Forums in regions where steps are being taken to harmonise communications policy, law and regulations with regard to cross-border infrastructure, e.g. the plans of the East African Economic Community to harmonise communications policy and law in the region.
  - *The participation of multiple stakeholders*, particularly of business, civil society, consumer groups, and different sectors of government in

infrastructure development initiatives. The planning processes for infrastructure development also need to support stakeholder participation to ensure they are inclusive, transparent, and receive input from all relevant stakeholders.

- Implementation of WSIS Action Lines.
  - Allocate enough resources to support the multiple action line process.
  - Structure the WSIS action line process in a way that allow for interested stakeholders to participate in ongoing activities.
- Linking internet public policy with human rights and with social, cultural and economic development concerns
  - Allowing and providing opportunities for discussion, debate and exchanges on the linkages between internet public policy and human rights through main sessions on rights issues, and through workshops and learning events. For people who have access to the Internet, the APC believes that users should have the same rights online that they have offline. This includes the right to freedom of expression and association, from which all other rights flow. Recently we have seen these rights under threat and increased adoption of repressive legislation.
  - Both access to the internet and the right to freedom of expression and association online are facilitating rights and need to be treated as such. This means that in the information society these rights need to be seen as indivisible.
  - Securing human rights in the internet environment involves understanding rights frameworks, a wide range of legislation and regulation at both national and cross national boundaries levels, different ways of implementing regulation and building consensus among different stakeholders of why freedom of information, expression and association on the internet are so important to harnessing the potential of the internet for human development. Consensus is not a likely prospect, but, during the WSIS forum there could be debate, dialogue and learning.
- Development of a facilitated and supported process for stakeholders to implement the use of indicators that can be used to measure the social, economic and cultural impacts of WSIS implementation
  - Various indicators exist, including the "The Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development Core ICT Indicators". The challenge in assessing, or measuring progress lies not so much in the development of more indicators, but in the ability to make them simple and ensure stakeholders and the capacity to regularly assess progress in a sustainable way. This includes being able to extract key learnings, to be able to communicate and share these learnings with a broad community, and to be able to apply learnings to ongoing implementation.

**4. Please make any specific comments that you wish to make on WSIS implementation and follow-up activity as a result of your experience, either concerning the outcomes of WSIS in general or in specific areas of WSIS implementation and follow-up.**

APC engaged with the WSIS Action Line follow-up processes related to access to infrastructure, openness, access to knowledge, participation, diversity and capacity building with a view to assessing which spaces are most strategic in terms of potential partnerships and which are most conducive to policy advocacy and action.

Not insubstantial efforts were made to co-facilitate three action lines with UN agencies during 2006 and 2007: C2 - Access to Infrastructure (with the International Telecommunications Union (ITU)); C4 - Capacity Building (with the UN

Development Programme (UNDP)); C6 - Enabling environment (with the UN Development Programme (UNDP)) and to monitor less intensively, action line C3 - Access to Knowledge, which is facilitated by UNESCO.

In 2008, APC withdrew from co-facilitating action line C2 with the ITU and working together with UNDP on action lines C4 and 6 as it was no longer possible to justify the resources required to maintain participation in a space with so little output and limited opportunity for policy influence.

Where does the potential added value of the WSIS follow up process lie? For APC, it lies in the potential to bring together different interested parties to discuss critical issues which are not necessarily being fully addressed elsewhere. It also lies in the opportunity to explore the interfaces between different policy issues and the diverse perceptions which different stakeholders hold about them, and the challenges they represent for the future.

The multi-stakeholder approach should be reinforced in all processes related to the WSIS outcomes.

### **5a. In what WSIS implementation and follow-up activities at an international or regional level has your organisation been involved?**

APC's work in the WSIS follow-up period from 2005-2010 responds to several of the processes outlined in paragraphs 83-122, in particular, paragraphs 88, 89 and 90.

As it is quite difficult to align work with each of the relevant paragraphs due to quite a lot of cross-over, implementation has been listed in relation to the following main categories, with the addition of specific mention of work related to para 90 in work to achieve the Millennium Development Goals:

- A. Promotion of the multi-stakeholder approach in ICT policy processes*
- B. WSIS Action lines and monitoring of outcomes*
- C. Internet Governance*
- D. Enhanced cooperation*
- E. Financing Mechanisms for ICTD*
- F. Using ICTs, as a tool to achieve the internationally agreed development goals and objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals*
- G. Publications that contribute towards implementation of the WSIS outcomes*

APC's efforts in the post WSIS phase have been focused generally on ensuring that open, universal and affordable access to the internet was prioritised in strategic global internet public policy spaces.

APC has been building its capacity to build awareness, deepen knowledge, build partnerships and develop advocacy strategies in related policy areas including access to knowledge, building the commons, freedom of expression (particularly in relation to privacy rights and content regulation), internet and communication rights, public participation and transparency and accountability in governance processes.

#### **A. Promotion of the multi-stakeholder approach in ICT policy processes**

APC has been consistently committed to both the promotion of, and participation in, multiple stakeholder partnerships in relation to participation in ICT policy processes at regional and international levels. These include participation in:

- The Internet Governance Forum,
- The Civil Society Advisory committee to the OECD Information Communication and Policy Programme, and various meetings
- The Global Alliance for ICT and Development

- The UN Commission on the Status of Women around the theme of financing for gender equality and the empowerment of women
- As observer for civil society in the eLAC process, the strategy for the information society in Latin America and the Caribbean (relating specifically to paragraphs 86 and 101 of the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society)

## **B. WSIS Action lines and monitoring of outcomes**

In 2007 APC, in partnership with Third World Institute, and with HIVOS in 2008, launched an initiative called Global Information Society Watch. GISWatch is a space for collaborative monitoring of implementation of international (and national) commitments made by governments towards the creation of an inclusive information society. It focuses on monitoring progress made towards implementing the WSIS action agenda and other international and national commitments related to information and communications. It also provides analytical overviews of institutions involved in implementation.

Each year, GISW focuses on a different theme, all of which relate to the WSIS action lines – 2007 (participation), 2008 (access to Infrastructure), 2009 (access to information and knowledge), and an emerging theme in 2010, ICTs and environmental sustainability.

In addition, APC and its member network have implemented many activities related to the following Action lines, a selection of which are listed below:

### **C2: Information and Communication Infrastructure**

*Catalysing Access to ICTs in Africa (CATIA - 2004-2006):* CATIA was a three-year project supported by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) to enable Africans to gain maximum benefits from the opportunity offered by ICTs and to act as catalysts for policy reform. APC, as the lead implementer for CATIA on African-led advocacy for ICT policy reform, supported six national advocacy processes in Africa. In the process, we developed a practice of how to support national ICT policy advocacy campaigns.

*Open access in Africa: EASSy, SAT-3/WASC research (2006-2007):* The “SAT-3/WASC post-implementation audit: Country case studies” was a large scale research project that documents the effect that the SAT-3/WASC submarine cable has had on communications on the African continent, as well as the opportunities that have been missed and the reasons behind these. The overriding objective of the research is to identify and document both positive and negative lessons that can be learned from the development, implementation and management of the cable.

*Global Information Society Watch (2008): Access to Infrastructure*

*Communication for influence in Central, East and West Africa (CICEWA 2008-2010):* CICEWA sought to identify the political obstacles to extending affordable access to ICT infrastructure in Africa and to advocate for their removal in order to create a sound platform for sub-regional connectivity in East, West and Central Africa. Participant action researchers brought an approach to ICT policy research, dissemination and advocacy through the building of sub-regional networks. They operated using the principle of multi-stakeholder partnerships developed through the CATIA experience to engage in evidence-based policy change.

*Communication for influence in Latin America (CILAC – Andean Region 2008 - 2009):* Building from the lessons of CICEWA, a similar project was implemented in the Andean region from 2009 to 2010. CILAC sought to integrate research, research communications, network-building and advocacy for affordable universal broadband in the Andean region. Research was undertaken to identify obstacles to universal affordable access to ICT infrastructure in the sub-region and a sub-

regional. ICT policy advocacy network (AndinaTIC) was developed that disseminate research and undertakes advocacy on ICTD and access to infrastructure at the sub-regional level.

*South African National Broadband Forum (2009 – 2010):* The project was carried out with the support of the Partnership for Higher Education in Africa (PHEA) to mobilise a number internet service providers (ISPs), communications workers, content providers, academics, alternative energy experts, a number of civil society organisations and private sector associations to advocate for affordable broadband access for all South Africans.

*Digital broadcast migration in West Africa: What's the dividend? (2010):* This project aims to work with civil society, broadcasters, policy-makers and regulators to produce the data and tools required to make informed decisions about the migration and the balance of costs and benefits they might choose. Carrying out research in Cote D'Ivoire, Ghana, Nigeria and Senegal and comparing them with five countries where the digital transition is more advanced (Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania and Uganda) we hope to:

- Get all stakeholders to focus their efforts on how to lower the cost of digital migration and look at how a wider range of benefits can be reaped.
- Encourage African policy-makers and regulators to open up their decision-making processes to broadcasters and civil society organisations and to have all of them tackle the changes happening from something more than just a technical perspective.
- Influence overall thinking about what represents "public interest" media in Africa and to create a couple of exemplars of a different way of tackling issues of content, access, governance and funding.

*Open spectrum for development (2010):* APC's "open spectrum" initiative aims to provide an understanding of spectrum regulation by examining the situation in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The initiative looks at how spectrum is assigned, who assigns it and what policy or regulatory framework they use, as well as the issue of spectrum scarcity.

### **C3: Access to Information and Knowledge**

*Global Information Society Watch (2009):* Access to Information and Knowledge

*Media piracy study (2009-2010):* 'Towards Détente in Media Piracy' was a two-year project that examined the nature and extent of media piracy and the effect of anti-piracy legislative and enforcement frameworks on access to knowledge in South Africa. The research phase began in January 2008 and finished in April 2009. It was carried out by researchers from APC and several South African universities and forms part of a larger study by research teams in Russia, India, Brazil, Mexico, and Hungary, on media piracy in their respective national contexts.

### **C4: Capacity Building**

*Wireless in Africa (2005-2006):* APC implemented a "capacity building for community wireless connectivity in Africa" partnership project, the first of a proposed series of projects to address capacity building for wireless connectivity.

*Wireless LAC (TRICALCAR - 2006):* As the APC team of staff and members from Latin America monitored the strengths and weaknesses of the African wireless workshops, the project was reconfigured to respond to different needs in the Latin American context. TRICALCAR, as the project became known, put more emphasis on constructing permanent usable networks that were left to communities who host workshops, as well as on developing a strong network of LAC experts and community network administrators. Through the project, a series of training materials were developed and localised into Spanish and published online; nearly a hundred telecentre operators, academics and other professionals were trained in

building community wireless networks; regulatory ICT policy concerning community wireless networks were mapped across the LAC region and an online network of people interested in using wireless technology for development work in LAC following workshops in three regions, was born.

*Pro-poor ICT access resource kit (2008-2009):* Business people, community activists and policy-makers have an interest in as many people as possible – including people in the lowest income-brackets- having access to the internet, being able to check out important information on websites and communicate cheaply via email or internet phone. In order to reduce poverty and foster inclusive development through affordable access to the internet, APC produced a resource kit for realising a universal access agenda, present promising options, experiences, lessons and opportunities in pro-poor access provision in developing societies. This kit consists of three modules, each focusing on a different topic: Policy and regulation; Advocacy strategies; Community- level projects

### **C6: Enabling environment**

Various activities already noted contributes to this line.

### **C. Internet Governance**

- APC has participated consistently in the IGF since it's inception. APC has had a pivotal role in regionalising the IGF by promoting and organising regional internet governance meetings in Latin America and Africa. APC has also been represented on the Multi-stakeholder advisory group, participated in various working groups to organise main sessions and workshops and various representatives have been selected to speak at opening, closing and main plenary sessions.
- Working with the Council of Europe and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, APC has developed a Code of good practice in access to information, public participation and transparency for all bodies involved in IG. The aim of the CoE/UNECE/APC project is to consider whether there is scope for developing a code of good practice on information, participation and transparency in internet governance. Such a code, if developed, could build on existing internet governance experience and the principles concerning Internet governance which were adopted at the World Summit on the Information Society

### **D. Enhanced cooperation**

APC has engaged with this process where possible. Various activities already described contributes to this line.

### **E. Financing Mechanisms for ICTD**

APC has engaged with this process where possible. Various activities already described contributes to this line.

### **F. Using ICTs, as a tool to achieve the internationally agreed development goals and objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals**

#### **MDG3: Gender Equality**

*Take Back the Tech! (2006 - ongoing):* During the 16 Days of Activism against Gender Violence each year, APC calls for everyone – especially women and grlls – to Take Back the Tech! and reclaim technology for the fight against violence against women. Initiated in 2006, the campaign creates awareness on how ICTs are connected to violence against women, strengthens the ICT capacity of women's rights advocates, creates original and varied content and is building a community to strategise around eliminating violence against women through digital platforms.

*Take Back the Tech! to end violence against women (2009-2011)*: This project aims to help women participants negotiate the fraught terrain of ICTs where freedoms go hand in hand with growing privacy and security concerns. In a multifaceted approach to the intersection between ICT use and violence against women and girls, APC is:

- administering small grants for interventions aimed at stopping violence against women through the use of ICTs
- localising the Take Back the Tech! campaign in the 12 selected countries
- organising Feminist Tech Exchanges to build the capacity of women's right activists, marginalised women and girls, including survivors of violence
- catalysing policy advocacy processes to integrate women's rights perspectives in ICT policies in national contexts
- working to increase women's involvement and leadership in ICT policy spaces that have an impact on women's rights.

Ultimately, we want to help create a global community of women and adolescent girls who are critically taking up ICT tools and using them to change what the UN Millennium project has called a global epidemic of violence.

### **MDG7: Environmental Sustainability**

*GreeningIT - APC on ICTs, climate change & environmental sustainability (2008-ongoing)*: A project that aims to address two critical challenges:

- How do national ICT policy environments address ICTs, environmental sustainability and climate change?
- How can ICTs be used more sustainably by ICTD practitioners, civil society organisations and service providers?

APC is undertaking action research, at national level, to address both of these questions, which aims to generate better understanding of the challenges facing us, especially in developing countries, in using ICTs sustainably (particularly in the context of climate change) and to identify gaps in the linkages between policies, standards and implementation.

### **G. Publications that contribute towards implementation of the WSIS outcomes**

#### **Books**

##### **Global Information Society Watch**

<http://www.giswatch.org/>

2007 – Participation: <http://www.giswatch.org/en/2007>

2008 – Access to infrastructure: <http://www.giswatch.org/en/2008>

2009 – Access to online information and knowledge:

<http://www.giswatch.org/en/2009>

2010 – ICTs and Environmental Sustainability: <http://www.giswatch.org/en/2010>

##### **The APC ICT Policy Handbook (Second edition)**

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/9555/>

This handbook aims to take the mystery out of ICT policy and make it easier to understand. In particular, it aims to build the capacity of those who want to understand more about the issues surrounding policy on ICT development and regulation, to grasp the policy process, and to become more involved as informed participants. It has a chapter on the WSIS process.

Published in November 2009

##### **Whose Summit? Whose Information Society?**

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/5587>

Developing countries and civil society at the World Summit on the Information

Society. This book, commissioned by APC and written by David Souter draws on participants' observations, detailed interviews with forty key actors and case studies of experiences rooted in five developing countries. It includes a section on conclusions and recommendations.

Published in January 2007

## **Research**

### **Equitable access**

The resources on this page are part of a series on equitable access to ICT infrastructure commissioned by APC. This has included an event on equitable access which took place in Rio de Janeiro in November 2007 as well as a series of papers and commentaries on the themes of business models, policy and regulation, tools and technologies and people, networks and capabilities.

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/6511/>

### **Communication for influence (CILAC): Research and advocacy**

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/8929>

### **Communication for influence in Central, East and West Africa (CICEWA)**

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/9321/>

### **Access: Building consensus on access in the IGF**

<http://www.apc.org/node/5878>

This paper identifies and documents the main areas of discussions and 'recommendations' that were generated under the Access theme at the second Internet Governance Forum in Rio De Janeiro, November 2007. A key issue for APC and its development of one of the main post-WSIS fora.

Published in 2008

## **Codes and charters**

### **APC Internet Rights Charter**

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/5677>

These are the rights and principles that guide the APC's network work. It includes internet access for all, freedom of expression and association, access to knowledge, shared learning and creation – free and open source software and technology development, privacy, surveillance and encryption, governance of the internet, awareness, protection and realisation of rights. We also produced a radio version in Spanish: <http://www.apc.org/es/node/8231>

Published in November 2006

### **Code of good practice on information, participation and transparency in internet governance**

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/11199/>

The development and governance of the internet have been largely built on principles of transparency and information sharing, of multistakeholder participation and of open discussion and decision-making, mostly inspired by WSIS outcomes. These principles have contributed greatly to the internet's dynamism and inclusiveness. This code of good practice builds upon the experience of the many entities concerned with Internet governance, in order to reinforce transparency, information and participation. It was developed with the Council of Europe and UNECE, in the light of the multistakeholder approach we reinforced after WSIS.

Published in September 2010

## **Statements**

### **APC's reflections on the Fifth Internet Governance Forum**

This statement includes reflections on the Vilnius IGF and recommendations for the future.

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/11513>

Published in November 2010

### **CSTD Working Group IGF Questionnaire: APC response**

APC responded questions on the achievements of the IGF, suggested mechanisms for improving the impact of the discussions, gave its view on emerging issues, gave suggestions on how to meet the changing circumstances and priorities of the IGF, etc.

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/11525>

Published in November 2010

### **APC's submission to the IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group questionnaire**

The Internet Governance Forum's Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) is a group of governments, private sector and civil society representatives, among which there are APC staff and members. This is APC's submission to a questionnaire that the MAG distributed as a follow up to its May meeting.

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/11300/>

Published in November 2010

### **APC's assessment of the fourth Internet Governance Forum**

APC wrote: "This year the fourth internet governance forum was playing it safe – perhaps because next year could be its last – but we still saw real progress. Privacy no longer plays second fiddle to security, people's rights online are recognised as central by all sides. Social networking was the new star centre stage. There are still too few women and people of colour but participants are getting younger which is a good sign. Next year APC hopes for an IGF focusing on development and human rights and looking to the future".

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/9642/>

Published in November 2009

### **Written Submission to the United Nations Group on the Information Society (UNGIS)**

The Tunis Agenda for the Information Society recognized that the issue of Financial Mechanisms for Meeting the Challenges of ICT for Development was a significant issue for developing countries. APC was represented on the Task Force on Financial Mechanisms (TFFM) whose report provided the basis for discussion. In this document we review progress on financing ICTD since 2005 and welcome the initiative of the UNGIS to hold open consultations on the matter.

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/9361/>

Published in October 2009

### **WSIS Follow up: APC contribution to the Secretary General's report on progress**

The Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) is one of the UN bodies that took up the follow up of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). This is APC's contribution to a CSTD meeting where a report from the Secretary General on progress made in WSIS follow-up and implementation was presented, that took place on May 2007 in Geneva, as part of a series of WSIS follow-up meetings.

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/6301/>

Published in June 2008

### **WSIS Follow up: APC contribution to the session on Development-oriented policies for an inclusive information society**

The Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) is one of the UN bodies that took up the follow up of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). This is APC's contribution to a CSTD meeting dealing with development-oriented policies for a social-economic inclusive information society, including access, infrastructure and an enabling environment, that took place on May 2007 in Geneva, as part of a series of WSIS follow-up meetings.

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/6302>

Published in May 2008

### **Statement from APC on the IGF open consultations, Geneva, February 2008**

The first preparatory meeting for the next Internet Governance Forum (scheduled for December 2008 in India) was held in Geneva on 26 February 2008. APC issued a statement recommending the implementation of regional and national IGFs, using sustainable development as a key theme and advising on the format of working groups to address and follow up on key issues.

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/5880>

Published in February 2008

### **APC statement from the 2007 Internet Governance Forum**

The second IGF concluded on November 15 and the Association for Progressive Communications (APC) presents an initial assessment of the event and makes suggestions for moving towards the third forum in India.

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/5390>

Published in November 2007

### **APC reflections at the commencement of the 2nd IGF**

APC's reflections and priorities at the commencement of the second Internet Governance Forum held in Rio de Janeiro in November 2007. This document includes APC's assessment of the first forum, held in Athens in 2006, and highlights our priorities for the second IGF.

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/6724/>

### **The World Summit on the Information Society: An overview of follow-up**

Civil society, in its final statement on WSIS, expressed its commitment to continue "its involvement in the future mechanisms for policy debate, implementation and follow-up on Information Society issues" by building on the processes and structures that developed during the WSIS process. But what does that mean in practice? What are the post-WSIS implementation processes, what actors are involved, when and where are they taking place and how can you get involved?

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/2577/>

Published in July 2006

### **Pushing and prodding, goading and hand-holding: Reflection from APC at the conclusion of the World Summit on the Information Society**

The Civil Society Statement on WSIS concluded that: "The broad mandate for WSIS was to address the long-standing issues in economic and social development from the newly emerging perspectives of the opportunities and risks posed by the revolution in Information and Communications Technologies (ICTs). The summit was expected to identify and articulate new development possibilities and paradigms being made possible in the Information Society, and to evolve public policy options for enabling and realising these opportunities. The statement finishes by saying that "Overall, it is impossible not to conclude that WSIS has failed to live up to these expectations." In this article, APC presents its verdict.

<http://www.apc.org/en/node/2578/>

Published in February 2006

### **5b. Which of these processes do you think have been most successful during the past five years and why?**

APC engages in five interrelated areas: research, advocacy, network building, capacity development and strategic communications and outreach (which includes communicating research results and developing information, tools and resources when needed).

The application of this approach or way of working, combined with our long standing prioritisation of linking 'practice' to policy advocacy, and linking local (through our network of national and programme members and partners) to

regional and global work, makes APC's work unique. This could generally be said to be the most successful element of APC's work generally, and specifically in relation to

- advocating for affordable internet access for all,
- making technology work to sustain the environment,
- using emerging technologies for social change,
- building the "information commons",
- securing and defending human rights in the internet sphere,
- gender equality and women's rights, particularly in relation to ending violence against women,
- and improving governance, especially internet governance,

could be highlighted.

The achievements obtained in those areas are described briefly in response to Q5A, and in APC's 2009 annual report, available at [http://www.apc.org/en/system/files/APCAnnualReport2009\\_EN.pdf](http://www.apc.org/en/system/files/APCAnnualReport2009_EN.pdf)

### **5c. What action should be taken to build on this success during the next five years?**

WSIS follow up processes should ensure that non-governmental stakeholders, as the APC, are able to effectively engage, participate and contribute to and share their their experience, expertise and knowledge, with broader communities involved in WSIS followup and implementation.

As outlined above, the APC community act locally but network globally with one another in ways that ebb and flow, but that continue to grow stronger through shared learning and action – applied at the local level in ways that benefit specific communities very directly, but also at the global level where we collaborate to advocate for policy and regulation that can enable people to use the internet freely and effectively to create more just societies.

In the next 5 years, APC will aim to build on the successes outlined in Q5b through:

- diversifying the APC community of action researchers and advocates and strengthening the capacity of this community to engage in action research in current and emerging priority thematic areas, communicating research outcomes effectively, and influencing policy debates and decision
- greater integration of gender equality and women's rights in all of it's work areas
- building capacity to raise awareness about the importance of ICTs and environmental sustainability, and to support an emerging network of ICTD practitioners to apply practical measures which will mitigate the negative impact of ICTS on sustainable environments
- building on it's long standing work to build awareness and strengthen capacities to advocate for the promotion, realisation and defence of internet rights

### **6a. Which WSIS implementation and follow-up processes do you think have been less successful during the past five years and why?**

Please see question 3a.

### **6b. What action should be taken to address these challenges during the next five years?**

Please see question 3b.

**7. In your view, what important new issues or themes concerning the Information Society have emerged or become important since the Summit ended in 2005, which deserve more attention in the next five years?**

- Internet governance and public policy in relation to sustainable development – development considers human, social, cultural development as well as impacts on the environment.
- Social networking and related issues of rights, changes in how people interact online in large communities that exist across national boundaries on privately owned platforms.
- The internet's role in building more open and inclusive societies: While this is happening in certain societies, we are also witnessing governments who feel threatened by the explosion in freedom of information, expression and association responding with repressive legislation
- The internet as an important element in protecting and expanding the global information commons. The APC fully supports economic opportunity, but not if it is at the expense of the public interest.
- The rise of the mobile internet, including vertical integration where mobile operators also run money transfer services, entertainment, content and other services. Are new monopolies being established in the process?
- The threat to net neutrality (both on the mobile internet and the traditional internet)
- Access from the perspective of people, not networks.
- Openness as disparate from privacy and security issues. It is important to address openness from its own specificities and as its own issue in terms of access to knowledge, freedom of expression, open governance, open infrastructure and technology, among others.
- Human rights and internet governance, particularly the relationship between different rights, the indivisibility of rights, and the fundamental facilitating role played by the right to access internet infrastructure, and the right to freedom of expression and association
- ICTs and Environmental Sustainability

**8. What do you think should be the priority themes and areas of work for the implementation of WSIS outcomes during the next five years, up to the comprehensive review of WSIS in 2015?**

- The importance of public access to internet infrastructure
- Consolidating the established internet governance mechanisms and processes that are widely accepted as being international, and in which all stakeholders are able to participate effectively.
- Ensuring the transparency, accessibility and accountability of such mechanisms
- Closer links between the IG community and communities that are not currently involved: human rights, environmental sustainability, development, culture, content, libraries, and more.
- Exploring the links between human rights and internet governance.
- Mobile internet, Mobile for Development is a good theme for WSIS Forum 2011. It is a theme that is crosscutting for most Action Lines, it covers different aspects like Mobile internet infrastructure, access to knowledge, net neutrality and so on
- Challenge and focus to bring the development community into the forum and discussions leading to the forum. Getting governments from developing countries to participate and enabling a platform for discussion and partnerships for them is an important aspect.
- Policy and regulation issues could be discussed at WSIS Forum 2011

- Financing is also an important crosscutting theme.
- Knowledge Exchange –topic open spectrum for development
- E-waste policies

**9. How, if at all, do you think that WSIS follow-up processes need to change to take account of changing circumstances and priorities?**

In addition to our response to Q3b), APC would like to underscore the importance of the WSIS followup process expressing a serious commitment to the implementation of the of multi-stakeholder approach to participation, pioneered during the WSIS process, as a key element to make the process more legitimate, relevant and meaningful. That openness would allow that the vision, priorities and emerging issues identified by different stakeholders living in diverse conditions in different parts of the world to be taken into account in shaping the agenda of the WSIS follow up processes, both in terms of process and issues (content). It would also contribute to the integration of the work, experience and learning from the global, regional and national levels.

**10. Please make any further comments below that you think would be useful to the review.**

APC remains committed to participating in the processes that emerged from the WSIS with a view to improving the process, building CSO participation in the process and monitoring implementation of areas of most interest to APC.