Session Title: A New Social Compact for Internet Governance
Date: Wednesday, Dec. 7
Time: 4:30 to 6 p.m.
Session Organizer: Samantha Bradshaw, Stephanie MacLellan, Centre for International Governance Innovation
Chair/Moderator: Laura DeNardis, American University
Rapporteur/Notetaker: Stephanie MacLellan
List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations Latha Reddy, former Indian ambassador, Global Commission on Internet Governance commissioner Sally Wentworth, VP of Global Policy Development, Internet Society Pablo Hinojosa, Strategic Engagement Director, APNIC Emily Taylor, Global Commission on Internet Governance – Research Advisory Network member Eileen Donahoe, Global Commission on Internet Governance commissioner
Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue): -The social compact: as envisioned by the Global Commission on Internet Governance in its final report, the social compact is a normative, multistakeholder approach to maintaining and expanding a free and open Internet. The rest of the discussion arose from this key issue, as detailed below.
If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each Presentation Latha Reddy: Described and discussed the key elements of the social compact envisioned by the Global Commission and why, despite the fact they seem self-evident, they are deceptively difficult to move forward on. For instance, the social compact is based on the recognition of fundamental human rights, a concept that is interpreted in widely divergent ways. Even elements that are generally agreed upon, like the need for more cyber literacy, require more resources to build worldwide. Sally Wentworth: Focused on how the report illustrates the interconnectedness of all Internet stakeholders and used the concept of collaborative security to frame the social compact. ie. Everyone who uses the Internet is interdependent on each other, so each person and stakeholder sector has a role to play in ensuring a trustworthy and open Internet. She also noted that any security approach must be able to adapt to the constantly-evolving Internet. Pablo Hinojosa: Offered a critical view of the social compact proposed by the report. He questioned the need for a "new process" to establish a normative social compact, given that work to support an open and secure Internet is ongoing in various existing forms. He also questioned whether the concept of a social compact was too rooted in Western thinking to translate to other

regions.

Emily Taylor: Described the report's scenario-building process as a good exercise that outlined the potential consequences of acting (or not acting) now. She noted that the work ahead was difficult but quoted Winston Churchill: "When you're going through hell, keep going." She acknowledged the potential for interdisciplinary research in Internet Governance, noting that people from different disciplines are becoming more interested in the topic and have new and valuable perspectives to contribute. Finally, she referred to the "uncomfortable truth" that states have a role to play in protecting human rights online, especially by countering the "state-like power" of private companies.

Eileen Donahoe: Called for an end to the paradigm that places digital security and human rights in opposition to each other, noting that digital security is a crucial human rights issue – for example, when activists are censored online or surveilled via digital technology. As such, she said, there are opportunities for new alliances in that space. She also said multistakeholderism is the best, or possibly only, way to achieve greater inclusion, diversity and trust. Despite its frustrations, she said it might be the only way through the "hell" referenced by Taylor.

Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session: (3 paragraphs)
The main topic of debate was whether the social compact could be interpreted as a "one world government" type of solution. Alejandro Pisanty of ISOC Mexico said discussions that have been sparked by the report included questions and comments about whether it was seeking "one single, global, uniform social compact," which would be counterproductive to attempt. He noted that he didn't personally believe this was the report's aim, but that it could create that damaging perception. Other participants questioned which, if any, institutions or enforcement mechanisms would be required to enact the social compact. The panelists emphasized in their discussion comments that the social compact was not intended to be a formal plan for implementation, but instead a strategic framework, or a set of guidelines for how to approach Internet Governance challenges and debates, and that the commission strongly advocated for a disaggregated, multistakeholder approach. A few stakeholders agreed that was also how they interpreted the social compact.

Two participants identified what they considered to be unique contributions of the Global Commission report. Ambassador Thomas Fitschen of Germany said it was the first time a group of experts "actually challenges us" with a glimpse at the kind of broken, dangerous future Internet that could emerge if its current trust issues are not solved. Michael Walma of the Canadian foreign affairs department (who disclosed that the Canadian government helped fund and promote the report) said he appreciated the report's assertions that Internet Governance doesn't have to be a zero-sum game, and that it is possible for everyone to gain – but only through the difficult work of multistakeholderism.

There was also some discussion of whether global conferences such as NETmundial or the IGF could help advance the social compact's vision. Jeremy Malcolm of EFF said this kind of "proactive" approach may be needed to achieve such ambitious goals. But Pisanty argued that such overarching international agreements or conferences always have limitations, and instead it would make more sense to work through various means: "moving pieces that will eventually lead

to an assembly of compacts that actually work instead of a single one that you don't achieve."

Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways: (3 paragraphs)
DeNardis suggested that the report's recommendations could be raised at the 2017 G20 and G7 meetings, and that multistakeholder groups participating in those meetings could build on the report to develop policy that moves toward the social compact vision.