

Statement on new chapter 5 proposals
Sep 29

Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus

Good evening everyone.

My name is Izumi Aizu of Glocom speaking on behalf of the Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus.

First, we welcome the fact that Subcom A has finally started to discuss the core issues .

Civil society welcomes the proposal made this morning by the delegation of Canada. We think it embodies the Geneva Principle of multi-stakeholdership including the full and equal participation principle, and greater emphasis on inclusion from developing parts of the world. We also welcome the explicit recognition of the WGIG process, the open consultation process.

With this encouraging proposal from Canada, Civil Society would like to reiterate our position on participation: We seek for full and equal participation of all stakeholders as a matter of principle and a matter of practice.

On the proposal made by the European Union, we have carefully read and analyzed it and have come to the following conclusion. First, we like to thank EU for having informal consultation with Civil Society this afternoon. We had very constructive meeting and made a meaningful dialogue. As we said during the meeting, we have some concerns and reservations in the following areas.

While we also believe that some adjustments or improvement is necessary in the area of Internet Governance, including that of the current ICANN framework, we do not agree that governments alone should be given any special role over other stakeholders as is expressed in this new EU proposal. We do not agree with the language in para 63. which says “with the special emphasis on the complementarity between all the actors involved ... including governments, the private sector, civil society and international organizations each of them in its field of competence;”, we have problem with “each of them in its field of competence “ which would confine our ability for full engagement, especially since the agreed language in para 42c attempts to limit civil society to community activity.

We do appreciate your inclusion of the 'end-to-end principle' in para. 63 since that gives the maximum level of freedom to users at the edge of the network.

We also do not support “Para 64. Essential tasks” as a whole. We do not think that the areas described from a) to e) in specifics should rest under the sole involvement of international government involvement, which is clearly against the multi-stakeholder principle WSIS has agreed with.

We also do not agree with the limited duration of the Forum. We see the need for the periodic review as is described in Canada proposal, but are not in full support of the default sun-set provision the EU proposes. With the same concern, we have doubts about the 2 phase approach of creating the Forum first, finish that, and then starting the transition.

Finally we have grave concern about the the level and application of International law, especially with relation to human rights, of the cooperation models.

We hope that EU together with other colleagues here in Geneva will find ways to improve these areas and come together for mutually agreeable solution. Again we need true multi-stakeholder practice with full and equal participation.

Thank you very much.