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0. Introduction

The Global Multistakeholder Meeting on the Future of Internet Governance, also known as NETmundial, is convened to discuss two important issues relevant for the future evolution of the Internet, in an open and Multistakeholder fashion:

1. Internet Governance Principles, and
2. Roadmap for the future evolution of the Internet Governance Ecosystem

The recommendations in this document have been prepared with the view to guiding NETmundial to consensus. This has been a collaborative effort among representatives of all stakeholder groups. More than 180 contributions have been received from all stakeholders around the globe. Those contributions have been taken as the basis for the elaboration of the recommendations here submitted to the participants of NETmundial towards the development of broad consensus.

The recommendations of NETmundial are intended to constitute valuable contribution to be used in other Internet Governance related fora and entities.
1. Internet Governance Principles Introduction.

NETmundial identified a set of common principles and important values that may serve as the foundation for an inclusive, Multistakeholder, effective, legitimate, and evolving Internet Governance framework. Human Rights

Principles related to Human Rights.

Human rights are central values that should underpin Internet governance principles. Rights that people have offline must also be protected online, in accordance with international human rights law, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Those rights include, but are not limited to:

- Access to information and the free flow of information
- Freedom of association
- Freedom of expression: Everyone has the right to hold and express opinions, and to seek, receive, and impart information on the Internet without arbitrary interference.
- Privacy: People should be able to exercise their right to privacy online the same way they do offline, including avoiding arbitrary or unlawful collection of personal data and surveillance.
- Accessibility: People with disabilities should be granted full access to online resources.
- Culture and linguistic diversity: Cultural and linguistic diversity should be encouraged and supported in a non-discriminatory manner.
- Development: The Internet has a vital role to play in helping to achieve the full realization of internationally agreed sustainable development goals.
Internet Infrastructure

Principles related to the Internet infrastructure.

To preserve an unfragmented, interconnected, interoperable, secure, stable, resilient, sustainable, and trustworthy Internet.

SECURITY, STABILITY AND RESILIENCY

Internet as an universal global resource, should remain a secure, stable, resilient and trustworthy network. Effectiveness in handling security depends on strong and constant cooperation among different stakeholders.

- Security, stability, robustness and resilience of the Internet should be a key objective of all stakeholders in Internet governance.

SINGLE AND UNFRAGMENTED SPACE

The Internet should continue to be a globally coherent interconnected, unfragmented, scalable and accessible network which allows the free flow of data packets throughout the community, with:

- A common set of unique identifiers
- A stable and globally coherent Internet operations

OPEN AND DISTRIBUTED ARCHITECTURE

The Internet should be preserved as a fertile and innovative environment and an open system architecture, with voluntary collaboration, collective stewardship and participation, recognizing technical management principles for efficient and improved network operation and preserving:

- End-to-end nature of the network
- Equal treatment to all protocols and data, delivered by the underlying communications

ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR INNOVATION

The ability to innovate has been at the heart of the remarkable growth of the Internet and it brought great value to the global society. For the preservation of its dynamism, Internet must continue to allow permission-less innovation through an enabling environment.

OPEN ACCESSPLATFORM

The Internet should be an open and accessible platform, promoting fair access to any content, applications and services at the user's choice. Internet should be a tool for equal opportunity and development, based on:

- Minimal barriers: There should be no unreasonable barriers or unnecessary burdens to entry for new users
- Universality: Access to the Internet should become universal as an effective tool for human development and social inclusion.
- Agility: Policies for access to Internet service should be future oriented and technology neutral, able to accommodate rapidly developing technologies and different types of use.
- Neutrality: The Internet should remain a neutral, free from discrimination, so as to
encourage free expression, the free flow of information and ideas, creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship

- Intermediary liability should be limited in line with international best practice
- Diversity: The Internet must respect and promote diversity in all its forms

**Internet Governance Process**

Principles related to Internet governance decision-making processes and arrangements.

Internet governance should be open, participatory, Multistakeholder, technology-neutral, sensitive to human rights and based on principles of transparency, accountability and inclusiveness, among others:

- Multistakeholder: with the full participation of governments, the private sector, civil society, the technical community, the academia and users in their respective roles and responsibilities.

- Open, participatory, process driven governance: The development of international Internet-related public policies and Internet governance arrangements should enable full and balanced participation of all stakeholders from around the globe.

- Transparent: it should be easy to understand how decisions are made, processes should be clearly documented and follow agreed procedures; procedures which should have been developed and agreed through Multistakeholder processes.

- Accountable: mechanisms for checks and balances as well as for redress should exist.

- Inclusive: Internet governance institutions and processes should be inclusive and open to all interested stakeholders. Processes should be bottom-up, enabling the full involvement of all stakeholders in a way does not disadvantage any category of stakeholder.

- Distributed: A governance characterized by distributed and Multistakeholder mechanisms and organizations.

- Collaborative: Internet governance should be based on and encourage collaborative and cooperative approaches to policy development that reflect the inputs and interests of stakeholders.

- Enabling meaningful participation: All stakeholders should be able to participate in any internet governance process. Particularly, Internet governance institutions and processes should support capacity building for newcomers, especially stakeholders from developing countries and underrepresented groups.

**Standards**

Principles related to the technical standardization of the Internet

**OPEN STANDARDS**

The Internet should be unique, interoperable, resilient, decentralized, secure, interconnected, and based on open public standards, embracing:

- Openness: allows for sharing and innovation, respecting rights and accessibility enabling
global competition;

- Interoperability: Open Standards facilitate interoperability and enable all to fully participate in the global network.

- Stability: The open nature of the Internet allows its continued growth, resilience and stability.

- Open development: Informed by individual and collective expertise and practical experience, decisions made by open consensus rather than voting.

- Innovation: Open Standards serve as building blocks for further innovation and contribute to the creation of global communities.

- Human rights: Standards must respect human rights contributing to the creation of global communities.

- Availability: Open standards specifications on which the Internet is based should be made accessible to all for implementation and deployment.

**Roadmap for the future evolution of the Internet Governance**

**I. Introduction**

The objective of this roadmap is to recommend the steps forward in the process of continuously improving the existing Internet governance framework ensuring full involvement of all stakeholders. Internet governance framework is a distributed and coordinated ecosystem involving various organizations and fora. It must be inclusive, transparent and accountable, and its structures and operations must follow a model that enable the participation of all stakeholders in order to address the interests of all those who benefit from the Internet. The implementation of the Tunis Agenda has demonstrated the value of the Multistakeholder model in Internet governance. The valuable contribution of all stakeholders to Internet governance should be recognized. Due to the successful experiences this model should be further strengthened, improved and evolved. Internet governance should serve as a catalyst for development and for promotion of human rights. Participation should reflect geographic balance and include stakeholders from developing and least developed countries.

Issues that deserve attention of the community in the Internet governance future evolution.

1. Internet governance decisions are sometimes taken without the meaningful participation of all stakeholders. It is important that Multistakeholder decision-making and policy formulation are improved in order to ensure the full participation of all interested parties, recognizing the different roles played by different stakeholders.

2. Enhanced cooperation to address international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet must be fully implemented on a consensual basis. It is important that all stakeholders commit to advancing this discussion through the working group created to this purpose under UN CSTD and/or other international Multistakeholder dialogues.
3. Stakeholder representatives appointed to Multistakeholder Internet governance processes should be selected through open and transparent processes. Different stakeholder groups should self-manage their processes based on publicly known mechanisms.

4. There is a need to develop Multistakeholder mechanisms at the local level since a good portion of Internet governance issues should be tackled at this level. Local Multistakeholder mechanisms should serve as a link between local discussions and regional and global instances. Therefore a fluent coordination and dialogue across those different dimensions is essential.

5. There should be meaningful participation by all interested parties in Internet governance discussions and decision-making, with attention to geographic, stakeholder and gender balance in order to avoid asymmetries.

6. The establishment of enabling mechanisms including capacity building and empowerment mechanisms, such as remote participation or adequate funding, and access to meaningful and timely information are essential for promoting inclusive and effective Internet governance.

7. All stakeholders must renew their commitment to build a people centered, inclusive and development oriented Information Society. Therefore in pursuing the improvements of the Internet governance ecosystem, the focus on Digital Development Agenda should be retained.

8. Internet governance discussions would benefit from improved communication and coordination between technical and non-technical communities, providing a better understanding about the policy implications in technical decisions and technical implications in policy decision.

Issues dealing with institutional improvements.

1. There is a need for mechanisms to consider emerging topics and issues that are not currently being adequately addressed by existing Internet governance arrangements and usually referred as orphan issues.

2. There is a need for a strengthened Internet Governance Forum (IGF). Important recommendations to that end were made by the UN CSTD working group on IGF improvements. Improvements should include inter-alia:

   a. Improved outcomes. Even keeping the nature of IGF as a non-decision-making body, improvements can be implemented including creative ways of providing outcomes/recommendations and the analysis of policy options.

   b. Extending the IGF mandate beyond five-year terms, and considering the IGF as a permanent forum.

   c. Ensuring guaranteed stable and predictable funding for the IGF is essential.

   d. The IGF should adopt mechanisms to promote worldwide discussions between meetings. The 1Net initiative could possibly provide a platform for Multistakeholder intercessional dialogue.
A strengthened IGF could better serve as a platform for discussing those orphans and emerging issues already mentioned in the previous point with a view to contributing to the identification of possible ways to address them.

3. There should be adequate communication and coordination among existing forums, task forces and organizations of the Internet governance ecosystem. Periodical reports, formal liaisons and timely feedbacks are examples of mechanisms that could be implemented to that end. It would be recommendable to analyze the option of creating Internet governance coordination mechanisms to perform on-going monitoring, analysis, and information-sharing functions.

4. In the follow up to the recent announcement of US Government with regard to its intent to transition the stewardship of IANA functions, the discussion about mechanisms for guaranteeing the transparency and accountability of those functions after the US Government role ends, has to take place through an open process with the participation of all stakeholders extending beyond the ICANN community. The IANA functions are currently performed under policies developed in processes hosted by several organizations and forums. Any adopted mechanism should protect the bottom up, open and participatory nature of those policy development processes and ensure the stability and resilience of the Internet. It is desirable to keep an adequate separation between the policy process and its operational aspects. This transition should be completed by September 2015.

5. It is expected that the process of globalization of ICANN speeds up leading to a truly international and global organization with an independent status and clear accountability mechanisms that satisfy requirements from its own stakeholders and from the global community. The relevant, balanced, and active representation from all regions and stakeholders in the ICANN structure is a key issue in the process of a successful globalization.

**Issues dealing with specific Internet Governance topics**

1. **Security and Stability**

   a. It is necessary to continue working pursuing international agreements on topics such jurisdiction, law enforcement assistance to promote cybersecurity and prevent cybercrime. Discussions about those frameworks should be held in a Multistakeholder manner. International agreements should include measures of restraining cyber weapons development and deployment.

   b. Initiatives to improve cybersecurity and address security threats should involve collaboration among private sector, researchers, technical experts, governments and NGOs. There are stakeholders that still need to become more involved with cybersecurity, for example network operators and software developers.

   c. There is room for new forums and initiatives, they should not duplicate, but to add to current structures. All stakeholders should aim to leverage from and improve these already existing cybersecurity organizations. The experience accumulated by several of them, for example the Forum of Incident Response and Security Teams (FIRST) and Computer Incident Response Teams (CERTs/CSIRTs), demonstrates that, in order to be effective, any cybersecurity initiative depends on cooperation among different stakeholders, and it can't be achieved via a single organization or structure.
2. Internet Surveillance - Mass and arbitrary surveillance undermines trust in the Internet and trust in the Internet Governance ecosystem. Mass surveillance and contradicts some of the principles proposed in this document. Surveillance should be conducted in accordance with the 'Necessary and Proportionate' principles. More dialogue is needed on this topic at the international level using forums like IGF and the Human Rights Council aiming to develop a common understanding on all the related aspects.

3. Capacity building - One of the key requirements for realization of Internet governance principles is ensuring that diverse stakeholders have not merely the opportunity for nominal participation, but in fact the formation and the resources for effective participation. Capacity building is important to support the emergence of true Multistakeholder communities, especially in those regions where the participation of some stakeholders group needs to be further strengthened.

Points to be further discussed beyond NETmundial:
Several contributions to NETmundial identified points that need further discussion and better understanding regarding the following:

- Different roles and responsibilities of stakeholders on the Internet governance ecosystem, including the meaning and application of equal footing.

- Jurisdiction issues and how they relate to Internet governance.

- A principles based code of conduct and related indicators for the Internet governance ecosystem.

Key messages
The Internet governance ecosystem needs to continuously evolve as described above, strengthening the Multistakeholder model across the entire ecosystem.

Capacity building is a crucial aspect to enhance the participation of all stakeholders in a meaningful way.

The IGF should be strengthened.

There are issues that are not being treated properly by existing Internet governance mechanisms. IGF is one of the venues for discussing ways to deal with those issues.

It is expected that ICANN continues working in evolving the organization toward a more global organization with a balanced participation of all stakeholders.

The US Government's special role with regard to the IANA functions should end in a short term and the transition should be conducted in an open, participatory and responsible manner.

All the organizations with responsibilities in Internet governance ecosystem have to develop principles for transparency, accountability and inclusiveness and implement them. All the organizations should prepare periodical reports on their progresses and status about these issues. Those reports should be made publicly available.

Further discussion is required to reach consensus on the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders in Internet governance.

All the organizations, forums and processes of the Internet Governance ecosystem are expected to
commit to implementing, as well as explicitly adhere, to all the principles agreed in NETmundial. It is expected that the NETmundial findings and outcomes feed other processes and forums, such as WSIS+10, IGF and all Internet governance discussions held in different organizations and bodies at all levels. The follow up and future discussions of topics listed in this document should prompt the creation of expert groups, task forces or groups of facilitators convened by existing entities or bodies. They should present reports of their works in major Internet governance meetings.