

A technical community coalition matrix of high priority issues for the GDC Zero Draft

Paragraph	GDC Zero Draft	Coalition view/comment	Suggested positions for negotiators
Theme 1: Positive reinforcement			
<p>Para 5; para 7(i) and elsewhere</p> <p>Para 4; para 56</p> <p>Para 25; para 26(b); para 57</p>	<p>References to the technical community as a separate stakeholder group</p> <p>Commitment to the vision and outcomes of the WSIS; commitment to building on the processes emanating from the WSIS</p> <p>Recognition of the importance of the Internet Governance Forum and commitment to its role, as well as continued efforts to ensure more diverse participation.</p>	<p>We recognise and appreciate that the co-facilitators of the Zero Draft listened to stakeholders during the consultation process, and reflected that input in the Zero Draft.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Express appreciation for this content and for listening and taking on board stakeholder views on these issues ● Protect these aspects of the GDC draft
Theme 2: Language describing the desirable attributes of the Internet			
<p>Para 25</p>	<p><i>“We recognize and commit to uphold the role of the Internet Governance Forum and multi-stakeholder cooperation in maintaining a universal, free and secure Internet at the governance, content and</i></p>	<p>It is unclear why the term “universal” is being used.</p> <p>The terms “open, free, global, interoperable, resilient and secure” are well established terms used by the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Seek clarification of the meaning of the term “universal”, and the purpose of its inclusion ● Amend both instances of “universal free and secure”

Paragraph	GDC Zero Draft	Coalition view/comment	Suggested positions for negotiators
<p>Para 26(a)</p>	<p><i>technical layers.”</i></p> <p><i>“We commit to ... Promote a universal, free and secure Internet and take concrete steps to create and maintain a safe, secure and enabling online environment for all ...”</i></p>	<p>multistakeholder community to describe the desirable attributes of the Internet, and should be used in the GDC unless there is good reason not to.</p> <p>An open Internet is accessible; anyone can get on the Internet to consume content from others, contribute content on existing services, put up a server, and attach new networks.</p> <p>A free Internet supports innovation and competition without requiring permission. Any person or organisation can set up a new service that abides by the existing standards and best practices, and make it available to other Internet users, without requiring special permission.</p> <p>A globally connected Internet allows anyone who wants to be part of the Internet to participate and exchange traffic with other participants without restrictions.</p> <p>An interoperable Internet uses open protocols and standards to support innovation and the</p>	<p>to read “open, free, global, interoperable, resilient and secure”</p>

Paragraph	GDC Zero Draft	Coalition view/comment	Suggested positions for negotiators
		<p>optimization of services to the benefit of users.</p> <p>A resilient Internet maintains an acceptable level of service even in the face of errors, malicious behaviour, and other challenges to the normal operations of its infrastructure.</p> <p>The protocols and infrastructure of a secure Internet, such as routing and DNS, form a base that is resistant to both intentional attacks and accidents.</p>	
<p>Theme 3: Defending multi-stakeholder Internet governance</p>			
<p>Para 25</p>	<p><i>“We recognize and commit to uphold the role of the Internet Governance Forum and multi-stakeholder cooperation in maintaining a universal, free and secure Internet at the governance, content and technical layers.”</i></p>	<p>“Multi-stakeholder cooperation” is not a term that is widely used by the multi-stakeholder community in relation to Internet governance.</p> <p>We are concerned that the term “multi-stakeholder cooperation” is a dilution of the concept of multi-stakeholder internet governance.</p> <p>“Multi-stakeholder internet</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace the concept of “multi-stakeholder cooperation” with “multi-stakeholder internet governance” or a “multi-stakeholder approach to internet governance”

Paragraph	GDC Zero Draft	Coalition view/comment	Suggested positions for negotiators
		<p>governance” is not just cooperation; it also includes creating processes and rules, and making and implementing decisions.</p> <p>It is an approach where all stakeholders engage constructively and on equal footing in the governance of the Internet.</p>	
<p>Theme 4: Consolidation (not proliferation) of Internet governance processes and forums</p>			
<p>Paras 61</p> <p>Para 62</p> <p>Para 63</p>	<p><i>“...we recommend that the General Assembly decides to establish a dedicated office for coordinating digital and emerging technology in the Secretariat...”</i></p> <p><i>“To track and monitor progress we request the Secretary-General to provide, within 12 months, a Compact implementation map that reflects the contributions of existing mechanisms and all relevant stakeholders...”</i></p> <p><i>“We further request the Secretary-General to establish</i></p>	<p>The GDC should not create new processes or forums, nor duplicate existing ones, particularly where these can be used, improved and consolidated to serve its aims.</p> <p>We are concerned that the establishment of new processes will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Centre discussions about the future of the Internet and its governance in multilateral forums - internet governance should be centred in multi-stakeholder forums ● Require new funding and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Centre the existing UN WSIS infrastructure, including the IGF, in the follow up and review of the GDC, instead of creating new processes or forums. ● Call for increased funding for the IGF to support this new role.

Paragraph	GDC Zero Draft	Coalition view/comment	Suggested positions for negotiators
<p>Para 64</p> <p>Para 65</p>	<p><i>an accessible and interactive Global Digital Compact portal within 12 months...</i></p> <p><i>“The pace of technology requires regular review of our digital cooperation. We recognize the role of the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development and ECOSOC in monitoring and reviewing progress of the Compact’s objectives, particularly as they relate to closing digital and data divides. We recognize the role of the UN Human Rights Council in tracking progress to foster an inclusive, open, safe and secure digital space for all.”</i></p> <p><i>“We decide to convene a high-level meeting, under the auspices of the General Assembly and entitled “High-Level Review of the Global Digital Compact”, to take place every two years starting in the 80th session with the participation of all relevant stakeholders...”</i></p>	<p>use up already limited UN resources - this funding should instead support and improve existing forums</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Risk duplication of efforts and not making full use of existing expertise. <p>The GDC should instead leverage existing multi-stakeholder processes and forums for follow up and review of the GDC; in particular the WSIS infrastructure in the UN, which includes the IGF.</p>	

Snapshot as at 23-Apr-2024