ASSOCIATION FOR PROGRESSIVE COMMUNICATIONS, APC

Contributions to the NetMundial – Global Multistakeholder Meeting on the Future of Internet Governance, 8 March 2014

ABSTRACT

Since its formation in 1990 the APC network and its members have been committed to achieving universal and affordable access to a free and open internet. APC has consultative status with the United Nations' Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), and has participated actively in the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) and Internet Governance Forum (IGF) processes, driven by the conviction that the internet is a global public good and a vital enabler of social justice, gender equality and human rights.

APC sees the NetMundial as an opportunity to:

- Reinforce and strengthen efforts to improve and democratise the governance of the internet;
- Help restore trust in the internet governance ecosystem after the 2013 revelations of mass surveillance of internet use and users;
- Generate concrete and actionable outputs which can then be (1) discussed further at global and regional Internet Governance Forums (IGFs) and at other relevant meetings in the course of 2014 and (2) be formally adopted by IG institutions (e.g. ICANN) and intergovernmental bodies (e.g. the UN General Assembly).

We urge the organisers of NetMundial to consider the importance of **reinforcing the United Nations'** IGF. The IGF needs to be strengthened and improved. Most of these improvements have been identified in the report of the CSTD Working Group on IGF Improvements. Many of these improvements relate to increasing developing country participation.

We believe that the NetMundial can contribute to strengthening the IGF, and its important relationship with other UN processes only if it states and maintains its commitment to link to the IGF process from the outset. Failure to do this could risk fragmenting the still fragile but emerging process of consolidating an inclusive, participative and democratic internet governance ecosystem.

We declare our strong support for your endeavour. We will do our best to contribute to its success.

Key words: internet access for all, human rights, multistakeholder internet governance, social justice and development, democracy.

Section 1. Internet Governance Principles

APC believes that the ability to share information and communicate freely using the internet is vital to the realisation of human rights as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1976), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1976) and the Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW, 1980).

The internet can only be a tool to empower the peoples of the world if its governance, development and management is based on the following principles (which are derived from the APC Internet Rights Charter from 2001 – http://www.apc.org/en/node/5677. The APC Charter is cited by other submissions to NetMundial, for example in http://bestbits.net/netmundial-principles/).

The APC Charter has seven themes, but below we shorten it to extract six key principles:

1: Access for all
2: Freedom of expression and association
3: Access to knowledge and shared learning and creation
4: Privacy, freedom from surveillance and the right to use encryption
5: Democratic, transparent and participative internet governance
6: Awareness, protection and realisation of human rights on the internet, and through the internet

1: Internet access for all

Internet access is an enabler of civil and political rights expression and of economic, social and cultural rights. Internet governance, development and management should at all times ensure affordable access for all. Access for all can help create more egalitarian societies, strengthen educational and health services, local business, public participation in political processes, access to information, good governance and poverty eradication.

To ensure access for all the following principles are essential:

Access to infrastructure irrespective of where you live. The internet serves as a global public infrastructure. This infrastructure must be widely distributed and support sufficient bandwidth, which will enable people everywhere to utilise its potential for raising their voices, improving their lives and expressing their creativity. People have the right to well-distributed national internet backbone that is connected to the international network, be they located on a small-island state in or in a large metropolis.

Inclusive design. Interfaces, content and applications must be accessible to people with physical, sensory or cognitive disabilities. The principle of inclusive design and the use of assistive technologies must be applied consistently.

Equal access for men and women. In many places women and men do not have equal access to learn about, define, access, use and shape the internet. Efforts to increase access must recognise and redress existing gender inequalities.

Affordability. Policy-makers and regulators must ensure that all citizens have affordable access to the internet. The development of telecommunications infrastructure, and the setting of rules, pricing, taxes and tariffs, should make access possible for all income groups.

Public access. Many people will never enjoy access in their homes, and access through mobile phones has limitations. Public access at telecentres, libraries, community centres, clinics and schools must be made available so that all people can have access within easy walking distance of where they live or work.

Access in the workplace. Employers must enable internet access in the workplace.

Cultural and linguistic diversity. Technical development and public policy must encourage linguistic diversity on the internet and simplify the exchange of information across language barriers.

2: Freedom of expression and association

Article 18, UDHR: Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion

Article 19, UDHR: Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media regardless of frontiers

Article 20, UDHR: Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association

Freedom of expression should be protected from infringement by government and non-state actors. The internet is a medium for both public and private exchange of views and information across a variety of frontiers. Individuals must be able to express opinions and ideas, and share information freely when using the internet.

Freedom from censorship. The internet must be protected from all attempts to silence critical voices and to censor social and political content or debate.

Freedom of association. Organisations, communities and individuals should be free to use the internet to organise and engage in online protest and organise offline protest.

3: Access to knowledge and shared learning and creation

Article 27, UDHR: Everyone has the right to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits

Article 27, UDHR: Everyone has the right to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits

Knowledge commons. Wide-spread access to knowledge and a healthy knowledge commons form the basis for sustainable human development. The internet enables knowledge-sharing and collaborative knowledge-creation.

Freedom of information. Governments must implement freedom of information legislation and ensure that all information, including scientific and social research, that is produced with the support of public funds be freely available to all through internet.

The right to share. The internet offers extraordinary opportunity for sharing information and knowledge, and for new forms of creating content, tools and applications. Providers of tools, internet services and content, should not prohibit people from utilising the internet for shared learning and content creation. Protection of the interests of creators must occur in a way consistent with open and free participation in scientific and cultural knowledge flows.

Free and open source software (FOSS) We support the use of FOSS on the internet. Working with FOSS is empowering, it builds skills, is more sustainable and it encourages local innovation. We encourage governments to make policies that encourage the use of FOSS, particularly in the public sector.

Open technological standards Technical standards used on the internet must always be open to allow interoperability and innovation.

4: Privacy, freedom from undue surveillance and the right to use encryption

Article 12, UDHR: No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation

Data protection. Public or private organisations that require personal information from individuals must collect only the minimal data necessary and for the minimal period of time needed. They must only process data for the minimal stated purposes. Collection, use, disclosure and retention of this information must comply with a transparent privacy policy which allows people to find out what is collected about. Data collected must be protected from unauthorised disclosure and security errors should be rectified without delay. Data must be deleted when it is no longer necessary for the purposes for which it was collected. The public must be warned about the potential for misuse of data supplied. Organisations have a responsibility to notify people when the information has been abused, lost, or stolen.

The right to use encryption People communicating on the internet must have the right to use tools which encode messages to ensure secure, private and anonymous communication.

Freedom from undue surveillance. People should be able to communicate free of the threat of surveillance and interception. Where surveillance does happen it needs to adhere to clear and transparent principles and comply with rule of law.

All surveillance by States should comply with the following principles (derived from "Necessary and Proportionate" https://en.**necessaryandproportionate**.org/, and Minister Carl Bildt's input at the October 2013 Seoul Conference on Cyberspace, http://www.regeringen.se/content/1/c6/22/65/90/696126a5.pdf:

> **i. Legality**: Be be based on laws that were adopted in a transparent manner through a democratic

process.

ii. Legitimate aim: Surveillance must be conducted on the basis of a legitimate and well-defined aim and surveillance measures may never be carried out in a discriminatory or discretionary manner and only by specified state authorities.

iii. Necessity and adequacy: The law should specify under what circumstances surveillance is necessary and justify its application, and then only to the extent adequate to achieve the legitimate aim.

iv. Proportionality: A sound judgment must be made by a judicial authority, ideally an independent court, to carefully assess whether the benefits of surveillance outweigh its negative consequences.

v. Judicial authority: Decisions on the use of communications surveillance should be taken by a competent authority. As a general rule, an independent court should take such decisions.

v. Transparency: States should be as transparent as possible about how they carry out surveillance and under which circumstances court orders may be requested to practice surveillance. They should provide information on how the surveillance legislation works in practice.

vi. Public oversight. Parliamentary or other credible institutions must provide oversight over the practice of surveillance and scrutinise how the laws work, to create transparency and build trust and legitimacy.

5: Democratic governance of the internet

Multilateral and multistakeholder democratic governance of the internet. Internet governance should be multilateral [note added in 2014: multilateral here means multiple countries and parties, not among governments] and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, the private sector, civil society and international organisations. No single government should have a pre-eminent role in relation to international internet governance.

Transparent and accessible. All decision-making processes related to the governance and development of the internet should be open and accessible at global, regional and national levels.

Decentralised and collaborative. The technological development and core resource management of the internet must be decentralised and collaborative, and help to ensure that the network is interoperable, functional, stable, secure, efficient and scalable in the long run.

Open architecture The internet as a 'network of networks' is made up of many interconnected networks, based on the key underlying technical idea of open architecture networking, in which any type of network anywhere can be included and made publicly available. Open architecture must be protected.

Open standards. Most of the protocols at the core of the internet are protocols based on open standards that are efficient, trusted, and open to global implementation with little or no licencing restrictions. The protocol specifications must remain available to anyone, at no cost, considerably reducing barriers to entry and enabling interoperability.

Network neutrality. The 'intelligence' of the internet resides in the computers, application-servers, mobile and other devices at the edges of the network, able to freely communicate directly with any other device on the network. This end-to-end model is the source of the massive innovation that caused the explosive development of the internet as the platform for broader economic and societal development. But if the more wealthy can pay to have their traffic on the Internet prioritised, the next 'Facebook' or 'Google' idea will never see the light of day. The principle of net neutrality must therefore be applied to prevent attempts to create a tiered internet controlled by specific multinational corporate interests.

The internet as an integrated whole This central interoperability is part of the internet's value as a global public good and should not be fragmented by threats to create national intranets, the use of content filtering, unwarranted surveillance, invasion of privacy and curbs on freedom of expression..

6: Awareness, protection and realisation of rights

Human rights protection, promotion, awareness and education The rights of people as users of the internet must be protected by international human rights declarations, law and policy practice. National, regional and global governing bodies must make information about rights and procedures related to the internet freely available. This involves public education to inform people of their rights when using the internet and mechanisms to address rights violations.

Recourse when human rights are violated People need free public access to effective and accountable mechanisms for addressing violations of rights. When human and internet rights are threatened by internet-based content, or by illegitimate surveillance, limitations on freedoms of expressions, and other rights, parties should have access to recourse mechanisms for taking action against such infringements.

Practical tools are also needed to support good Internet governance practice. APC has worked on such a tool and developed, in partnership with the Council of Europe and UNECE, the *Code of good practice on information, participation and transparency in internet governance,* The Code continues to a be living document and as such is a work in progress. More information about it is available: http://www.intgovcode.org/index.php/Main_Page

Section 2. Roadmap for the Further Evolution of the Internet Governance Ecosystem

1. Current critical IG issues

Public policy issues that relate to the internet are not finite.

They will emerge and change over time. Some will stand out as priorities at certain times, as does at present, surveillance. The diversity of these issues is such that it would not be feasible to centralise decision-making about them.

The internet does not exist in a parallel dimension. It is part of social, economic, cultural, personal and political life. A more appropriate manner for phrasing this question would be: What relevant international public policy issues do NOT pertain to the internet in any way in today's world?

Nevertheless, there are a number of key issues that are currently attracting attention which the NetMundial could address:

> **i. Internationalisation of DNS and Root management**: Some internet governance bodies such as ICANN and IANA are not fully internationalised. Note that by 'internationalised' we do not mean to propose oversight by national governmental entities, but still required is the involvement of ALL countries. While on the one hand internet management is distributed, power and influence of this management has remains concentrated. Efforts should be directed to better coordination and inclusion, rather than centralisation. For concrete proposals on how to do this we endorse the submission by Avri Doria available at: http://content.netmundial.br/contribution/one-possible-roadmap-for-iana-evolution/153

> **ii. Consolidating democratic, inclusive, multistakeholder internet governance processes:** Many governments are still fundamentally uncomfortable with the WSIS principle that the management of the internet needed to involve 'all stakeholders'. The term multistakeholder is still used quite loosely, and some of the challenges that come with multistakeholder processes, such as dealing with conflict of interest and ensuring pluralism, need to be addressed. Multistakeholder processes need to be improved where they exist, and established where they don't.

iii. Uncertainty about the future of the IGF: This is related to the previous point. While the United Nations-based IGF, the most long-running, large scale and successful experiment in multistakeholder internet policy debate and dialogue remains insecure, and under-resourced, the future of multistakeholder participation in internet policy will remain uncertain.

iii. Network neutrality, and how this complex concept is evolving in the context of increased convergence of internet, telecoms, broadcasting and content services and applications. The impact of international and national consolidation in these sectors creating combined media and network service providers which have the power dominate markets, is of particular concern here.

iv. Fair and transparent cross-border regulation and taxation of global internet businesses that ensures competition and choice for users, and while supporting local laws and 'in-country' business interests.

v. States acting to limit freedom of expression and association on the internet. Many governments are engaged in internet filtering and censorship. Some are manufacturing and exporting the devices used to do this. Some even order operators to shut down the internet, or the telecommunications networks the public use to access the internet. This fragments the internet, creates a heightened sense of insecurity and violates human rights.

vi. Mass surveillance and privacy. Data mining and exploitation of the personal data and behaviour of internet users has given rise to innovative business models, but it urgently needs to be contained, and very carefully managed. It is out of control and taking place with no or little concern for the fundamental rights of individuals. Legislation dealing with data protection, internet intermediary liability, and interception monitoring and surveillance needs to be revised to ensure robust protection for human rights.

vii. Security on the internet is essential, but the prevailing approach places the security of States, narrowly defined by the security sector, before the security of the internet itself, and of internet users. Journalists, human rights defenders and whistleblowers who expose corruption and the abuse of power cannot be effective if they do not have access to a secure internet.

viii. Cyberdisarmament. The open collaborative nature of the internet is antithetical to using it to attack. By its very nature it is vulnerable because it is a trust-based network. Efforts to fight crimes committed on the internet are important and legitimate, and require collaboration among states, and among law enforcement agencies and other stakeholders. Good progress is being made in this regard. The issue we raise here is different. It is the increasing militarization of the internet and the development of means to attack it at an infrastructure level. Some governments appear to be developing units that can commit cyberwar, or use cyberspace for military purposes. This all undermines its integrity, security and potential to benefit humanity. We need States to commit to "cyberpeace" and to cyberdisarmament.

2. Existing IG forums and bodies dealing with policy or technical outcomes

Policy development involves research, consultation, networking, drafting and debate and dialogue. There are multiple policy development forums, and, as we said above, the range of public policy issues pertaining to the internet are so broad that expecting one forum or body to develop all internet-related policy would be very problematic.

Some of the existing forums and bodies involved in internet policy include:

i. The IGF is an established process for multistakeholder internet policy dialogue. It has a mandate to be more outcome-oriented from ECOSOC via the CSTD WG on IGF improvements and in early 2014 the Internet Society (ISOC) proposed that the IGF develops policy recommendations which can then be considered for adoption by IG bodies or governments. Many civil society entities had made similar proposals previously.

ii. National efforts. More countries address internet policy issues at national level. Some have established ministries or departments, and some, as is the case in Brazil, a multistakeholder body to deal with internet policies (CGI.br).

ii. International intergovernmental bodies such as the World Intellectual Property Organisation and the Human Rights Council (to mention just two) deals with internet related issues. The HRC has passed several resolutions related to the internet in the last few years. Another example is the UN Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, appointed by the UN Secretary General, which addresses policy related to 'cyber terrorism'.

iii. Regional inter-governmental bodies such as the European Commission and the African Union Commission address a wide range of internet policy issues, as do the regional United Nations Economic Commissions. An example of an improved existing mechanisms is the implementation of the eLAC2015, the Information Society Plan for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEPAL/ECLAC) to which all governments in the region are signatories and in which non-govermental stakeholders have been formally included. In Africa the regional commission, UNECA, acts as the secretariat for multi-stakeholder forums such as the African IGF. At a subregional level, regional economic bodies such as the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the Union of West African States (ECOWAS) have developed internet-related policies to support their member states, such as in the area of cyber-security and infrastructure deployment.

iv. Internet specific institutions such as ICANN, and others involved in the technical coordinaton of the internet, such as ISOC and the numbering organisations. As these are well-known and their roles already well documented we will not elaborate on them further. They work well, but their accountability, transparency and degree of inclusiveness can improve. In particular, as we have said above, ICANN needs to internationalise fully, and to ensure that it does not exceed its current role, and that it strengthens civil society participation.

3. How and why are these issues not being adequately dealt with by these forums or organizations?

There is a vibrant and diverse internet governance ecosystem at work. The challenges are that:

(1) All parts of this ecosystem are not adequately inclusive, transparent and accountable,

(2) they do not communicate and collaborate with one another adequately, and

(3) power and influence in this ecosystem and its components are very unevenly distributed.

It is important to look at communication, collaboration, participation, power and influence in both the ecosystem and its components. This is neither a trivial exercise, nor a once-off exercise, the 'health' of the ecosystem should be evaluated continuously. A role we believe the IGF is well-suited to.

Contributing factors to the above three problem areas are:

i. **The absence of commonly accepted principles for internet governance** at both substantive and procedural levels. There is not even a common understanding on what the internet is from an economic or legal perspective.

ii. **The absence of a clear conceptual approach to internet governance**. For example, when IG is discussed, distinctions are not made between governance, policy and regulation, and management and coordination.

iii. Lack of maturity in some multistakeholder bodies. For example, stakeholder identification and representation can be fairly adhoc and mechanisms to guard against conflict of interest are not strong enough.

iv. Unequal distribution of power among governments in global internet governance spaces. Decisions are often shaped by these power configurations rather than by a desire to achieve the best possible public interest outcomes.

v. Limited resources, financial, time, capacity and knowledge among stakeholders that care about internet governance, but who are not centrally involved.

vi.Different approaches by governments to inclusive and multistakeholder policy processes with some very unwilling to involve civil society and others unwilling to involve business entities.

vii. Lack of resources to optimise the IGF, the most inclusive policy forum currently in existence, which influences global and national internet policies directly and indirectly. The IGF could play a far more effective role in facilitating collaboration and communications within the internet governance ecosystem if it had sufficient capacity and resources.

viii. Assumptions that models that work in the technical coordination of the internet can be replicated for addressing broader public policies.

ix. Clear gender imbalance among those who participate in current internet governance arrangements. Limited participation by women must be addressed.

4. Possible responses to these challenges

Rather than create new policy-making or oversight mechanisms we recommend the following:

i. International agreement (formal and informal) that internet governance is distributed and that it has to be viewed as an ecosystem and that centralising it is neither feasible, nor desirable. While this growing ecosystem risks being overly complex and opaque, it also increases depth, diversity, and the opportunity for participation and creative problem solving.

ii. Renewal of IGF by the UN General Assembly for 10 years rather than the current 5. This will allow it to work on a longer cycle and be more effective in implementing is mandate and constantly improving while doing so.

iii. Strengthen the IGF to enable it to facilitate communication, deliberation and collaboration for the broader IG ecosystem. This will also facilitate the process of identifying issues that are not currently being addressed effectively by existing mechanisms. Financial resources could come from, among other sources, revenues from gTLD domain name registrations, and be used to facilitate developing country participation. The IGF has evolved into a regional, national and global process which is linked to the UN, but is also independent. It is inclusive. Its value should not be underestimated.

One concrete suggestion that would address the above challenges and strengthen the IGF is to **establish an IGF-linked information clearing house and policy observatory** or for the IGF to work closely with other such clearing houses and policy observatories, such as the European Commission's proposed Global Internet Policy Observatory.

iii. Achieve broad agreement on principles for internet governance; principles that have the broadest possible public interest and respect for fundamental human rights at their core, and that affirm accountable, transparent and inclusive decision-making process.

iv. Strengthen meaningful participation of developing country stakeholders in existing mechanisms.

v. Improve government recognition of the value of nongovernmental stakeholder

participation in public policy making. Public policy, including internet public policy, cannot be implemented by governments alone and implementation will be more effective if these stakeholders are involved in the development of policy in the first place.

vi. Empower civil society engagement within existing mechanisms at national, regional and global levels. Civil society heterogeneity must be recognised as a strength and existing mechanisms must ensure that modalities for participation provide ample space for the diversity of voices in civil society to be heard.

vii. Inclusion of women in internet governance spaces must be measured, and concrete action taken if the results indicate unequal participation.

viii. Develop codes of practice for internet governance processes and bodies which provide guidelines and a monitoring framework for ensuring that they are transparent, accountable, participative and accessible. APC has worked on such a tool and developed, in partnership with the Council of Europe and UNECE, the *Code of good practice on information, participation and transparency in internet governance.* The Code continues to a be living document and as such is a work in progress. More information about it is available: http://www.intgovcode.org/index.php/Main_Page We recommend that a useful practical action for the NetMundial meeting would be to propose and support further work on this Code and we are ready and willing to assist in such a task.

ix. Existing bodies to avoid 'mission creep'. Institutions with power and resources should avoid expanding their current scope without exhaustive consultation with the broader internet community.

x. Establish national multistakeholder forums and processes for dealing with IG and internet policy issues, and ensuring that they include marginalised voices.

xi. Capacity building initiatives including, but not limited to, continuing and strengthening the capacity building tracks and pre-events at regional and global IGFs.

xii. Clarify the role of governments: Governments have special responsibilities under international human rights law as bearers of duties to respect, protect and promote human rights. They also have the responsibility to protect and promote the public interest, which requires them to:
a) Consult widely and be participative in the development of local internet policy;
b) Respect the role and responsibility of civil society to challenge governments, including in international fora;
c) Convene and support inclusive multi-stakeholder internet governance processes at national level;
d) Bring sufficient political will to bear so that cooperation emerging from these processes does not stagnate;
e). Establish transparency and accountability mechanisms to enable public scrutiny of their decisions and positions on internet governance;
f) Take steps to ensure that businesses meet human rights standards (for example, in line with the United Nations guidelines on human rights and business)

xii. We also recommend that governments:

a) Participate actively in global, regional and national IGFs and in other multistakeholder internet governance mechanisms. The burden (which can be substantial) of such participation can be lightened by government collaboration with other stakeholder groups;
c) Uphold transparency and multi-lateral agreements, and avoid internet-related agreements that undermine the principle of governments operating on an equal footing and with transparency. Examples of the type of agreement that should be avoided are ACTA, and more recently, the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP): trade agreements which are not publicly

negotiated within the international system.

xii. Consider new mechanisms to address specific issues if the need arises: IG stakeholders and bodies should identify public policy issues without a clear home, and whether they are best dealt with through a single institution or forum, or through a distributed model. In some instances there might be a need for a new mechanism to be established to address specific issues which have emerged, such as, for example, to address and prevent the rights violations that result from mass surveillance by governments, working with corporations. We would still recommend first exploring whether, for example, existing human rights mechanisms cannot play the needed role before opting for the creation of new mechanisms.

5. How these possible responses will ensure stability, resilience and efficiency and also comply with principles of equitable multistakeholder participation, accountability, transparency and predictability?

- Achieving consensus on basic principles for internet governance will enable the development or adoption of a code of good practice, and monitoring framework that can be used for both self, peer and bottom-up assessment of the extent to which IG mechanisms and processes are effectively democratising and acting in the public interest.

- Adoption of such principles at international intergovernmental level can consolidate recognition that the internet is a global resource, of benefit to all humanity and that governance of the internet should therefore involve all stakeholders, and not be reduced to haggling or horse trading based on narrow national interests or geopolitical conflicts, but based on international agreements such as the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the International Covenants on civil and political and on economic, cultural and social rights;

- Accepting the distributed 'ecosystem' approach to internet governance will pave the way for positive evolution through ongoing collaborative learning, evaluation and debate, provided it is effectively inclusive and 'multi-stakeholder' in its nature, transparent, accountable and accessible.

- A stronger, longer term IGF, either hosting or linked to an information clearing house, and mechanisms and resources to strengthen the participation of developing country governments, will be able to continue its role as a forum for debate and dialogue, but also play a more dynamic and responsive role in facilitating communication, and cooperation within the IG ecosystem.

- Consolidating the multistakeholder approach and making it more democratic, participative, effective and consistent, will enable the constructive evolution of the ecosystem.

We also endorse the Best Bits roadmap submission http://bestbits.net/netmundial-roadmap/ and the Korean Civil Society Submission http://content.netmundial.br/contribution/korean-civil-society-submission-for-netmundial/146