

Thursday May 31st 2018

Opening Statements

Opening Speaker Ms. Pauline Krikke, The mayor of the Hague

(the following text is a summary of main statements of the presentation. A youtube video captures the full session here: <https://youtu.be/eaOpgmRy718>)

Decades ago, a flying machine flew from Paris to the Hague, and that has changed the world, just like new technologies happening today. Just like the Internet who has brought in entirely new dimensions and issues today. Wars are not only fought physically on the battlefield, but in cyberspace too. Bullying is not only spoken words but also messages spread through the internet. Theft is no longer a physical hack, but also on the digital world in the form of hacking. News is also reaching us in digital ways in which the truth has become elastic. Companies use data to gain impression of customers and influence their behavior. More information is found on the internet and threatens legal certainty and privacy. The internet has fundamentally changed our lives.

The City of Hague is examining how to deal with this age of digital world, where does the boundaries lie, what is acceptable and what is not acceptable. Where does freedom of expression start and censorship begin? And to what extent we want governments and commercial parties to decide what we can and cannot see.

Social media can create even deeper social divide. Turning people against each other.

What is the situation of Human Rights in the digital world? The general data protection of the European union is of course an important step forward. But that is not the end, it is all about creating a digital world in which freedom, security, economic growth and prosperity go hand in hand, and where citizens are protected.

The Hague is therefore pleased to offer a platform for this summit for accountability and internet democracy. In and around the Hague there is a great deal of experience available on the subject of the Internet. Apart from this knowledge in the past of the 125 years, it has proven itself to be a unique place for building trust between parties, confidence between nations and faith between businesses. A place for international dialogue. And just as binding agreements were made among warring parties, for the first time at the Hague peace conference. Today we need to establish rules for the digital world. But in view of the scope, this will not be an easy task, because essentially, it's not a digital issue but an ethical one. However, I believe that humanity can overcome this, as the generations that come after us will be grateful for that.

Opening Speaker Ms. Kajsa Ollongren, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, the Netherlands

(the following text is a summary of main statements of the presentation. A youtube video captures the full session here: <https://youtu.be/m7mtDQY4Nq4>)

“Welcome to the City of the Hague, the city of peace. We are in the midst of building institutions of legal judgements that can contribute to securing international peace. And the law that this is based can be traced all the way back to the 16th century on a celebrated book called “on the law of war and on peace” and it still marks the international law today. The author was a systems thinker, he had an orderly mind and in today's world we could do well some of that order. So, when he was focusing his mind in the middle ages on sailing on the seas, in the same way today we face the challenges of surfing on the internet, and that is the reason why we all come here today.”

“I don't think we can immediately answer the question on regulating the internet. But we are hoping these days to reach consensus on how to regulate this subject. How do we feel on how to go about it. What do we have in common. It has to be a discussion and today is a good day for that.”

- “the blue whale game” in India, where users were asked to cut their wrists or jump off building... the game was hosted in Russia and for India there was no way to remove the game”. This shows the importance on how we must think on how to regulate this.
- “What is accountability, it depends on who you talk to. It is an interface between regulating everything and upholding all freedoms... We must reach consensus. And it must be international and multi-stakeholder with all parties.”
- “we live in an era of networks with 4 billion online people. We recognize the urgent need for discussion.”
- “We have been asked to contribute to how accountability can help to regulate the internet.”

Opening Speaker: Mr. Houlin Zhao. Secretary General of ITU

(the following text is a summary of main statements of the presentation. A youtube video captures the full session here: <https://youtu.be/EyEgPt7puc>)

“We at ITU have worked to build a more connected and inclusive world for over 150 years. (ITU was created 1865 by 25 states). Just think about what discoveries like the telegraph, the telephone, the radio the TV, broadcasting, satellite have done to bring people closer together. ITU helps to bring information technology to the many. The digital revolution must be brought to the developing revolution, and the sustainable development goals. As to date, more than half of the world's population is not connected, and the connected populations must be provided with trusted environments.

- “Accountability is the cornerstone of a truly ethical, inclusive and empowering internet. Without it we cannot build trust, and without trust we undermine our collective efforts to connect all the peoples of the world.”
- “We are accountable to all those who do have the connectivity to harness the Artificial intelligence and the data revolution. We are accountable to all those who cannot take part and are discriminated.
- Accountability and non-discrimination should be built into the system.”
- “ICT tool to help us to achieve every and single SDG.”
- “ITU recently held the Technology for Good Summit in Geneva last week, to create stakeholder environments for communities to engage in AI for good.”

“May all beings find peace, as we explore how to build a more accountable and democratic internet. May we find ways to work together bring the power of ICTs to all people, to all segments of societies”

Moez Chakchouk, Assistant Directeur General, UNESCO, Communications and Information sector

(the following text is a summary of main statements of the presentation. A youtube video captures the full session here: https://youtu.be/EC-vR9Lq_gw)

“When we speak about accountability in the digital age, the R.O.A.M principles can guide us. The UNESCO Internet Principles R.O.A.M (Rights, Openness, Accessibility for all, Multi-stakeholder), at international and national levels and they help us to enhanced evidence-based policies.”

“As the freedom of online coalition was established in the Hague in 2011. The coalition can play a more efficient role. The key principle that was put forward in that conference was that the same rights that people enjoyed offline, must be protected online. This was later endorsing by the UN Human Rights Council in 2011 resolutions and subsequent resolutions of the UN Human Rights Council, the United Nations and UNESCO.”

“All internet stakeholders have a role to play to ensure that respect of human rights online. Through ratifying Human Rights treaties (i.e. Covenant of Civil and Political rights), states are obliged to respect, protect and fulfill human rights. Private companies also have to respect human rights and this is enshrined in the guiding principles of Business and Human Rights key principals (2011).”

“Along with the enormous benefits of the Internet, it has brought new challenges including the spread of enticing to hatred and online harassment, content aimed at youth to radicalize towards violent extremism, disinformation and propaganda campaigns to dilute public trust in news sources and professional journalism.”

“We must be careful to not introduce new regulation that might limit human rights and to freedoms of expression, access to information and to privacy.”

“The idea of accountability should not be used by governments to reduce the legitimate political expressions, instead self-regulation may be the best way to achieve accountability.”

“In looking at the field of accountability, we can draw lessons from journalism. Professional journalism operates under self-regulation and adheres to accountability standards in terms of verifying sources of collected information, and the evaluation of publishing of materials on the basis of public interest and safety.”

“UNESCO supports a first line of media accountability of self-regulation, as seen in press conferences with the mechanisms put in place to appropriate readdress and correction.”

“Historically, state regulation of content on any platform has too often been disproportional and deployed for partisan political purposes. These purposes are not recognized as legitimate under international human rights law. And therefore, even the best of intentions on one side can have unanticipated consequences on the other side.”

“No single entity (without participation of multi-stakeholders) should determine accountability over the internet unilaterally. Multi-stakeholders opportunities need to be hardwired and must be facilitated at local, national, regional and international levels.”

“With all our partners (ITU included) we have to close the gap of Media and Information Literacy skills.”

“In the coming months UNESCO will launch a summit on the Human Rights and the Ethical dimensions of Artificial Intelligence. I invite you to participate to join the initiative on shaping the way forward.”

“Internet companies must strengthen their self-regulatory frameworks as well as to practice multi-stakeholder modalities in developing standards and processes of accountability based on human rights, openness and accessibility for all.”

“I thank and commend the city of The Hague for its draft proposal on the Hague Global Principals which constitutes a basis and draft guidelines for discussions related to internet accountability. I hope that this inaugural summit will be the first of many to come, to address the subjects relevant to our times and help shape our values of humanity into the future.”

Boris Koprivnikar, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Public Administration of the Republic of Slovenia, member of the ITU/UNESCO Broadband Commission

(the following text is a summary of main statements of the presentation. A youtube video captures the full session here: <https://youtu.be/GmLVij9nLTI>)

“We are doing here is exactly what we have to do now. When we are facing a new digital or industrial revolution. We have to understand the key principals in order to coordinate our actions and principals.”

“From the invention of the wheel, steam power, electricity, cars, combustion motors, transistors and now the internet. It’s another industrial revolution but the principals are the same. People always used what bring comforts and more productive to meet additional demands (aging population, etc.)

- The internet does not do this or that. People do this or that. The internet is just a tool is new because its faster and its global. From electronic, to mobile to smart tools, smart tools are connectivity to everything and this bring new challenges and new ways of living our lives. We have mankind knowledge concentrated in the palm of our hands. It will change the way we work, we will be active in different ways, so how will we pay taxes, pay insurance, collect pensions and so on. New technology will change this and we will have to synchronize our key systems.
- The internet is bringing global transparency, which is bringing a problem and also for transparency and democracy. We believe in ecosystems, not a single technology can exist by itself. It’s all connected, we cannot use one technology so we have to developed the ecosystems
- The internet is global, so we have to help the international community to work together
- Key technology is digital cooperation across all stakeholders and in dialogue. This is the key technology to speed up the development.
- We believe in transparency and way to gain trust. In openness and open data, we share everything except data that is causing interference with public and private space.
- “The role of government is not to build these solutions but to create the enabling environment to grow these technologies and the related use.”
- What happens in the digital world happens also in the real world. We could lock the data but there will be no communication among peoples.

- We have to keep Internet neutrality, and to keep technology neutrality and service neutrality so that we have to maintain it collectively and to not give too much power to one player.
- The internet should be maintained as a public space, and that is a public space but not a trusted verified space like in own's home or private bank account. We have to bring new tools using AI to fix issues, just like seat belts were prescribed for car safety.
- We didn't have a sense of data property / privacy until it was exploited for commercial use

Vint Cerf, Google Chief Internet Evangelist

(the following text is a summary of main statements of the presentation. A youtube video captures the full session here: <https://youtu.be/GdSIC28LZKQ>)

“Accountability and Internet democracy are two interconnected elements, and it’s important to have this discussion as over 50% of the world population are connected on the internet. In the early days of the Internet, the main concern was to make the Internet work, and there was no anticipation of what could happen when the general public came a part of the internet community. Now in 2018, we know what is possible. The diversity and motivation of people(s), without mutual considerations, and so how do we draw account on parties who perform harmless acts, and how to do that while preserving human rights and the essence of democracy, and that is the conundrum with which the Hague summit will be dealing with.”

“We can create an environment where surveillance is the norm or where we try to know what everyone is doing or we try to anticipate any possible bad behavior but that is not necessarily a world that many of us would want to live in.

- We have to draw the challenge, where do we draw lines, how do we achieve discipline for bad behavior while at the same time protecting people’s privacy and freedom of action.
- On the Internet, everything is connected and this is one of the most difficult problems as well. We have the freedom to speak and to hear, we have the freedom to decide what we accept and what we reject. We can to apply our wetware (brains and mind) to whatever we see and hear. Any maybe that is a very important part of this story, is that its training people to think critically about what they are doing, being and hearing on the Internet- how to reject false information or poorly based information and how to accept content which has true value
- How to shine a light ahead to see how we assure our democratic principles are preserved while at the same time, we protect people from a potential harm on an online environment.

Roundtable: The State of Play in Accountability and Internet Democracy

(the following text is a summary of main statements of the presentation. A youtube video captures the full session here: [lay in Accountability and Internet Democracy https://youtu.be/ow1FkfxGR0](https://youtu.be/ow1FkfxGR0))

Panelists:

- Prof. Alexander Rinnooy Kan, Senator Dutch Parliament (**Moderator**)
- Andrea Millwood Hargrave - Director General International Institute of Communications
- Latha Reddy - Co-chairman Global Commission on Stability in Cyberspace
- Bernhard Jungwirth - Director Austrian Internet Ombudsman
- David Greene - Civil Liberties Director, Electronic Frontier Foundation
- Edo Haveman, Facebook
- Jan Kleijssen, Director Council of Europe
- Gary Shapiro - CEO Consumer Technology Association

The moderator Prof. Alexander Rinnooy Kan, stated that there are a certain number of key challenges to be addressed with concern to how to measure and implement and act properly within a multi-stakeholder approach. The whole issue of fake news setting the political stage in an undesirable manner. We need to think of a way to get a grip on this issue.

- Cyberbullying, make sure those who are bullied against those who are bullying. Hate speech, tricky to distinguish from freedom of expression.
- The Internet is global, and how to regulate a global internet?
- Privacy evasion: privacy is now a global issue. What can we do to protect privacy beyond European initiative? What is the current state? Is there a future to the GDPR? We need to think.
- Robotics and AI has enormous potential and progress. And we need to better understand how it works. We need to increase the levels of transparency

Andrea Millwood Hargrave - Director General International Institute of Communications

We need to increase the level of accountability as they are so many stakeholders. Therefore, international spaces for debate are important, to discuss and to cooperate, exposure to new ideas, and to build institutional capacity, especially for developing nations.

- Cooperation across sectors is important and discussed
- Data collection is key for economic growth
- Regulation is also a key, especially with trans-border technologies like the Internet.
- Investments for infrastructure and taxation and the accountability for both content producers vs content carriers
- Ethics by design
- We are in a collective environment, so how can we best benefit from them

Latha Reddy - Co-chairman Global Commission on Stability in Cyberspace (UN Governmental Group of experts)

We need for widely excepted norms to be created on cyber space to ensure that the internet stays open, accountable, democratic and innovative. It will take time to bind and enforcing norms and then to legislate the framework so as to implement them.

- UNSG Guterres quote: "called for Global rules to minimize the impact of electronic warfare on civilians"
- The 'World Wide Web' is not the 'Wild Wild West'. There are many groups working and its multi-stakeholder such as the global committee on the stability of cyberspace such as cyberstability.org

Bernhard Jungwirth - Director Austrian Internet Ombudsman

We run the Internet ombudsman, which is the alternative dispute and resolution body mainly focusing on e-commerce issues and we also implement the European safer program dealing with child safety online. I want to share three statements for this introduction.

- Let's invest in a more balanced power-play for the rules in the digital world. What is the role of trusted flaggers? What is the role of the internet ombudsman? The race for attention is eroding the pillars of our society
- Many business models on the internet are not only data driven but also attention driven, so design takes into consideration to spend time as much as possible on those tools. This is also unwanted side effects, on over use, on children, to compete for attention of parents
- Media literacy is crucial but should not be an excuse to avoid media regulation
- School should implement programs for children and parents should be more aware of responsibility

David Greene - Civil Liberties Director, Electronic Frontier Foundation

We are a civil liberties organization based in the US that advocates for civil rights such as freedom of expression and privacy online. The internet is multifaceted, data privacy and cybercrime and it's hard to solve all the problems by looking at the internet as one big thing. As a free speech lawyer, I am afraid of accountability, as tools that are very well-meaningly created are often used as tools for oppression and censorship. And we have to be extremely careful when we created any regulatory rules or structure that it will be subject inevitable to be exploited for bad purposes.

- The internet is used differently around the world. It is used by people in power differently to those who are dissidents, used by people with privilege differently that those without privilege. And all this affects the freedom of speech.
- The US law is not absolutist on freedom of expression on the internet. We tend that way but it's not entirely correct.
- A discussion on fake news will take us 3 days of conference.
- About 5 Latin America countries are contemplating internet fake news laws and they are faced with strong civil rights movements.
- If we take things down from the Internet, we have to make sure that we take them down within a human rights framework.

Edo Haveman, Facebook

Facebook is an idealist and optimistic company. Our mission is to give to people the power to build communities and to work closer together. We are focused on the good that connecting people can do, and as Facebook as grown, people have a new tool to connect to people they love, and for building new communities and stay connected to their businesses.

- Although a lot of good has been created on Facebook. It is clear that we have not done enough to prevent our tool from being used for harm, and that goes for fake news, for foreign interference in elections, hate speech, and data privacy... as Mark Zuckerberg said, "we didn't do enough to take a broad enough view of our responsibilities, and that was a big mistake".
- We endorse Four principals that are also listed in the Hague Global Principals:
 - **Community engagement** is important, of users and where we should draw the lines and understand their worries. We are planning to do more
 - **Transparency**, we have published our internal accountability reports and transparency guidelines
 - **User controls**: we thing users should have control over their online experiences. We give users more controls to enhance their experience.
 - **Appeals**: we want to let people know that we can remove the post or not remove the post according to Facebook guidelines.

Jan Kleijssen, Director Council of Europe

Recently two videos were created in the US on Obama and Trump, but these videos were fake. This raises huge questions for the organization I work for democracy, rule of law and human rights, because if we cannot trust digital media, we could be heading to a society, as Lord Putnam put it last night where "the lack of trust becomes the new norm".

- This is a huge challenge to democracy and think about the rule of law, how many criminal cases are judge on the basis of audio-visual evidence. If this evidence is no longer permissible in court, we need to review the court proceedings.
- A fraction of cybercrime is actually prosecuted. What does that tell us about the rule of law? If the same percentage applied to all criminal cases, I think most justice ministers would not stand a chance in parliament.
- Government alone (even in my case with 47 governments) cannot do this alone. The truly multi-stakeholder way is the only way to move forward. That model also takes into account that stakeholders assume responsibilities and accept to be held accountable.

Gary Shapiro - CEO Consumer Technology Association

Innovation to me, is what it is about. Our gift to the future is the internet. Our gift is the sense of solving some of the biggest problems in terms of healthcare, food production, energy, water, access to transportation, mobility and communication. They are being solved by this generation because of innovation. The question for me is how to solve these problems quicker to end the suffering of the people quicker. Some of these issues is just conflicting values. What is more important. Is privacy more important that social control? China has decided that more social control is important (i.e. Chinese Social rating that could lead to ban from travel). Independent journalist doesn't exist because every journalist must be a government employee. China has made that decision and to get 1.5 Billion people well fed and in an increasingly modern society with economic growth. They have made decisions strategically for them. It's not a decision that I would prefer to make. I believe that innovations are much more important and freedoms are much more important. Europe has made a decision. Europe is focused on privacy as

a very very high value compared to other things. We have GDPR, the right to be forgotten and the right to be erased.

- The American approach is like goldilocks and the three bears. One bowl is too hot and the was too cold, and the last one is just right. In terms of privacy what we are doing in the United States seems to be right because it balances those two.
- Certainly, we value children higher then we value adults. Children have the right to be forgotten.
- We in the US, ranked countries with how innovative they are, we looked at a broad range of criteria (freedoms, innovation, diversity, Tax laws, R&D models. New business models for cars, home sharing, drones) to produce an innovation scorecard where Netherlands came in the top quartile.
- The big goal is to improve the human condition and it's a question of what you want to sacrifice along the way.
- We have to be welcoming change, because the status quo is our enemy. Positive change is where we should be heading
- Let's see where the innovation goes, and if there is real harm, not theoretical harm. Let's aim at the harm and let's prescribe the behavior and not the technology.

Brief statements, where do we go from here:

- We need some basic principles as backstops
- The real challenge is how to be totally inclusive and how to we build trust (between internet users and non-users)
- We need strong public bodies with resources, so that the resources in this powerplay can be more balanced. It should about society that should decide on the rules.
- We might to rethink concept of accountability that maybe we are not doing right now
- GDPR is related to data protection but not cyberbullying
- We need to chop this up into manageable pieces and not as a whole
- Rules for content removal, not just legal, but established norms
- keep trust or win back trust, create a multi-stakeholder environment to deal with these principals, how should legislation look like
- All tools developed for GDPR are available to Facebook users worldwide
- Trust, and with trust comes responsibilities that could lead to criminal liability (e.g. diesel cars tests)
- GDPR is pretty broad, large companies can comply with it and it is symptomatic of the European challenge that regulation comes before. WE should not make it more difficult to make innovation possible.
- Trust is really important. We should not look at trust monolithically. So, we should take small steps forward.

Mr. Thorbjorn Jagland, Secretary General, Council of Europe

(the following text is a summary of main statements of the video presentation. A youtube video captures the full session here: <https://youtu.be/BZZQ5UegdKQ>)

“New digital technologies are creating new opportunities and challenges alike. When it comes to exercising our rights, participating in our democracies and ensuring the effectiveness of our institutions. Innovation has come hand in hand with complexity and public anxiety about the impact on our daily lives. But we all know knee jerk reactions rarely solve intricate problems. In order to harness technology for the benefit of our citizens. We need a smarter approach. We need proper, comprehensive analysis of the issues and measured and effective responses. That is our approach here in the Council of Europe. Justice, cybercrime, data protection, freedom of expression. These are just some of the areas with which we are engaged in with the ever-growing impact of new technology. Our cybercrime convention, or our data protection convention and our internet governance strategy are testament to our commitment to stay ahead on the curve.

I was particularly pleased to have reached an agreement with over 60 CEOs of internet companies to work together on the promotion of human rights, democracy and the rule of law for 830 Million Europeans across over 47 member states. This is not only a reflection of our core values but also our determination to cooperate with stakeholders in the private sectors, now and in the future. By working together, we can strengthen the accountability and deliver an internet of values for all.”

Panel I: Shaping an Internet of Values: The Role of Accountability and Internet Democracy

(the following text is a summary of main statements of the presentation. A youtube video captures the full session here: <https://youtu.be/sXwvDUpNlJc>)

Panelists:

- Dr. Indrajit Banerjee - Director knowledge Societies UNESCO (**moderator**)
- Prof. Aimee van Wynsberghe - Director Foundation for responsible Robotics
- Olaf Kolkman - Chief Internet Technology Officer, Internet Society (ISOC)
- Derek O'Halloran - Digital Economy & Society System, World Economic Forum
- Lynn St. Amour - Chair, United Nations Internet Governance Forum (IGF)
- Steven Wilson, Director European Cybercrime Centre, Europol
- Peter Batt, Director General of Digital Society, Administration Digitization and Information Technology
- Malavika Jayaram, Executive Director Digital Asia Hub
- Tadao Takahashi, Director General PROJECT i2030/BRAZIL

Dr. Indrajit Banerjee, Director UNESCO Knowledge Societies Division

- As the Secretary General Dan Hammerskjold once said "The united Nations was not created to take you us to heaven, but it in order to save us from hell". I think that could be said about the Internet too. The internet has evolved these last few years with the Internet of things, the internet of this and that, and now we are beginning to think about the internet of values, how it should be governed (the debate has been going on for some time, including with the panelists on stage). How to leverage this amazing tool for development, for prosperity, for shared peace and understanding. We are also concern about what is not going on too well on the internet. As the population increases on the internet every day, we are going to be confronted with new and emerging challenges and problems.
- What is the internet of values? What do we consider and how do we consider?

Lynn St. Amour - Chair, United Nations Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

"While the internet gives the voice to so many, those voices are still mainly outside the processes that they wish to influence". A straightforward consultation model is not multi-stakeholder. Also, there is not just one multi-stakeholder model or process.

- While the IGF is a UN convened organization, supported by IGF and UNESCO, and held in the UN with UN protocols, yet all of its daily operations is driven by a multi-stakeholder, bottom ups consensus based model. Which makes us unique is the UN system. Much of the community believes in sovereignty and certainly in distributed responsibility
- The Internet is so intertwined in so many aspects of our lives, economic, social, cultural, political, differs by country and differs by street in some countries. It would be naive to think that we can resolve these issues so quickly.
- We need forums to break down issues to see what we are really trying to address. We are not addressing problems of the Internet, we are addressing problems of nature that are aided or fueled by the Internet actually enables. Many of the issues of nature, of human desires and human wants, can be address by existing bodies. When you find them lacking then let us address where they are lacking. Let us start from the base that actually addresses the core of the problem and it's not the internet infrastructure.
- When I hear things like the Internet of values, I am not sure what the internet of values is. We might want to think of an internet shaped on values of global values of a society, we may want to think of an internet shaped on the different views of society globally. And the same thing with Internet democracy. () but I do think the internet provides new tools and processes that can aid democracies.

Tadao Takahashi, Director General PROJECT i2030/BRAZIL

Where do we stand when we talk about the internet of values? The internet was not supposed to be secure, the internet is not that strong on the point of view of different classes of people doing different things. The main problem of the internet has to do with its origins and its virtue. When we look back since the 80's we don't really see a major rupture of technologies, we see it as a process, we piled up more of technologies and properties but it was somehow predictable. Now this piling up of technologies and properties has made us reach a point where amazing things are possible. We now have speed of communication, ability to store gigabits of things, whatever, and we have amazing computing power. Put them together and we see AI coming to live to build wonderful things. Now we are entering the realm of content, content has to do with people, and has to do with meaning, with intent and so on and with nothing to do with technology. What mass media has been all of last century and what is it now? Radio, television, computers, networking, etc. So, we are increasing connectivity, and the main danger beyond mass communication, is mass communication and interactivity that is personal.

- Issue of multi-stakeholder: we agree on the general concept. We have an idea of what GAFA (Google, Apple, Facebook and Amazon) should and shouldn't be doing, the service they provide is a free service, so we cannot ask to break up the monopoly, as it's a free service (with indirect payment but not directly).
- Most governments fail to do what they should be doing.

Moderator Dr. Indrajit Banerjee, UNESCO:

- "it's all about people, there are crooks online and there are crooks in the real world."

Peter Batt, Director General of Digital Society, Administration Digitization and Information Technology

It seems some people would like us to have two different world, an analog one and a digital one but we only have only world, one that is increasing dominated by information technology and digitization and we are all in it. Self-driving cars drive physically on our roads and not in a virtual environment. So, one world, our world. There can therefore be no two sets of ethics or two sets of rules that can guide our lives.

- The internet is a global public good, a 'global commons' and should be treated as such. It obliges governments to guarantee its accessibility, safety and security of effective infrastructure. It also means that regulations are mandatory to safeguard its benefits for everyone.
- We could inspire from the paragraph one of the German traffic rules. Setting rules is necessary, living by the rules and enforcing rules is key.
- Multi-stakeholder is nothing other than consensus vetting.
- Road traffic regulation was a multi-stakeholder and step by step process. And today we have liberties of pedestrians
- Law and rules is nothing but an order for peace. It is the nature of rules.

Prof. Aimee van Wynsberghe - Director Foundation for responsible Robotics

Ethics is not something that is static, really its dynamic and an ongoing process. As technology evolves, the rules of the game changes and we have to constantly reevaluate how our values, their meaning and their interpretation, and how they are changing our understanding and going forward.

- Ethics plays a role in the protection of individuals (Baltimore-report, the four principles of bioethics to protect individuals and society), and it can play a strong role in innovation.
- We should see the internet and robotics as experiments and we should think of how we want consumers to participate and take it on from there. For example, AI has increasingly become a Blackbox in terms of how it functions, and we can take it from there to understand what it means for individuals interacting with it. Should we be informed when interacting with it.
- What kind of impact with sexrobots have?
- Ethics as a source of innovation and not stifle it. We should look at accountability as a concept. Just like sustainability was seen as an abstract constraint, and now it is a requirement. ***So, let's make accountability the new sustainability.***
- Education systems should provide better opportunities for understanding accountability and how it can complement sustainability. We need centers of excellence.
- We should use our ethics as a final goal. Where do we want to be in 10 years from now and let's reverse engineer from that point.

Steven Wilson, Director European Cybercrime Centre, Europol

There is a complete absence of rule of law on the Internet. Cybercrime is on the rise and in many forms including cybercrime as a service. There were 114 new ransomwares last year, and a challenge for rule of law, especially when we also face encryption as barrier to exercising rule of law. There are many types of crime online, the darknet provides for drug supply, child abuse material and weapons. There is increasingly denial of service attacks, in high qualities to the point of crashing the internet. There is an increasing convergence of criminality (we don't know who is doing what? A 16 year old teenager or a state.) What happens when things go off (smartphone, TV, internet), they will be panic. The intellectual community has to provide a response, and meanwhile we continue to fight cybercrime where we can. Ransomware is the largest problem in the last two years, we have created a Nomoreransom.org

Malavika Jayaram, Executive Director Digital Asia Hub

Who are we to shape values? The people in this small room? With what legitimacy and that bothers me in the framing. We talk about the real world, but for a lot of people, the digital world is more real, as they find love, solace, meaning. So that is more real than real. "The road to the internet of hell is paved by the balancing of metaphors"

- if we want to talk about values, we need to stop with the balancing things, as though they have equal weight that can be traded, as though there is a market for it where some will win and some will loose and some are trending. But I oppose this. There is a way to increase security and privacy. Freedom and security and we need to invest in that rather than amplify.

- We also have to talk about values as a backdoor to relativism, who's values are we talking about, and what values? Who is included and who is not? Who is a proxy for somebody else? Need for inclusion and respect for diversity.
- The internet has a strange property, like in physics, if it's a wave or a particle, when talk about the internet governance, are we talking about the internet as an object? Something that we need to regulate or not regulate? Or are we looking at the way in which the internet governance, (medium of governance) in the way who accesses what and who sees what news, who gets to play, who is excluded... how is my digital footprint going to catch up with me and foreclose certain options
- principal: "nothing about us without us" from the disabilities community
- principal:" from the environment community in terms of externalities, "I didn't create the harm but I am affected by it"
- My concern is that in order to find one bad apple, we seem to think its ok to bring the entire arsenal and toolkit on all of us, In order to find the one bad apple, we are all affected, We are all concerned, we are all under surveillance, all our freedoms that are curtailed with a magical premise that we will be able to catch the bad guys, and guess what none of us are uniquely good or uniquely bad all the time, we all have elements of both, this idea that there are the obvious bad guys who will use encryption to do creepy evil things to small kids, as opposed to those of us who just want to share messages with our loved ones.
- If we don't use our rights, we will lose them. Every act of assertion, is an act of activism.
- We need a bottom up approach to multi-stakeholder-ism in order to build trust and value. Trust that the system works, and that is accountable, and that it is trustworthy

Derek O'Halloran - Digital Economy & Society System, World Economic Forum

There are different value systems at all levels of society (government, private sector, civil society) and different goals that they want to achieve. We will not be able to agree on all value systems, but we may want to protect certain attributes of the values in the digital environment. We have engaged different stakeholders to what we want to protect.

- Inclusion: access to internet and decision making, concentration of wealth and power
- Sustainability: if we want to continue to reap the benefits, we need sustainability of the economics and the value for society. Shaping is an important word.
- Trustworthiness
- And how to enforce. Via a multi-stakeholder environment. The multi-stakeholder approach is necessary but not sufficient. It takes time and could look different depending on perspectives.
- We build a multi-stakeholder discussion to deal with drones in Rwanda

Olaf Kolkman - Chief Internet Technology Officer, Internet Society (ISOC)

The Internet is the network of networks. This is the complexity of what we are dealing with. There are no borders, no jurisdiction, and this is only the layer of connectivity. The layer of application development. The layer of economic social benefits. It provides the opportunities and the threats that people are talking about.

They are a few properties:

- It gives global reach and integrity
- there is a concept of permission innovation (one can build on internet without permission) for example: blockchain was developed without permission and this brings good and bad stuff.
- Interoperability and mutual agreement are properties of the internet network itself
- There is no one regime to solve the problem, but we have a piece meal at where we can solve the issue. There are guiding values and principals, that can be defined together.

Panel II: Policy Challenges and Implications for an Accountable and Democratic Internet

(the following text is a summary of main statements of the presentation. A youtube video captures the full session here: <https://youtu.be/WMHhzTBE5Ug>)

Panelists:

- Arthur van der Wees – Institute for Accountability in the Digital Age (Moderator)
- Pavan Duggal, Chairman at International Commission on Cyber Security Law
- Jaya Baloo - CISO KPN
- Mårten Schultz - The Swedish Law and Internet Institute
- Prof. Mireille Hildebrandt - Free University of Brussels, Radboud University Nijmegen
- Boris Wojtan, Director of Privacy, GSMA
- Mark Nelson - Co-director Stanford Peace Innovation Lab
- Jan Middendorp, Member of Parliament NL
- Dr. Boyan Radoykov, Section Chief, Knowledge Societies Division Communication and information Sector UNESCO

The moderator Mr. Arthur Van der Wees starts with a question, can we bring in the notion of co-creation into the discussion.

- We need to find the blind spots to fix it, we need to know who is working on what so that we can improve the processes. We need to define this for the next 100 years.
- Accountability is our responsibility, we are part of the solution and also the problem.

Dr. Boyan Radoykov, Section Chief, Knowledge Societies Division Communication and information Sector UNESCO

UNESCO took early actions in 1997 the Info-ethics congress in Monaco. Since then UNESCO has been working to providing normative instruments, raise awareness of member states and implementing concrete projects in this area including fight against radicalization on the internet in 2014.

On the positive note, in these 3 years, things have radically changed. ISIS was working on the internet, we fought for 3 years, and today all big players today like Twitter comply with the UN Global Action Plan to combat radicalization online. Twitter has closed more then 300'000 accounts in these 3 years, this tendency and results are there. This demonstrates that international cooperation and political will are important to reach successful outcomes.

Education, organization and justice are equally as important. Education we have to sensitize governments officials on education as well. About 96% of cyberspace is the dark web and only 4% is the surface web. When we talk about accountability are we only talking about the 4%. Education is also important especially for young people, especially via Media and Information Literacy. Putting order in this organization is crucial. Justice is inclusion, Access for all, multilingualism, cybercrime are all important issues to be considered in this category.

Prof. Mireille Hildebrandt - Free University of Brussels, Radboud University Nijmegen

Concerning the Internet democracy and accountability, raising issues like who is going to decide on what sort of principals and norms, values, is going to rule us all. I would look at the concept of legal by design and look at GDPR including the bit on extra territorial issue

- What makes GDPR different with this problem. What do we mean by law. I am avoiding the term regulation. Law has democratic legitimacy, with elected representatives. It's part of the constitutional democracies. Law has been a matter of text. Law is text driven as opposed to code driven or data driven, so it's interesting to look at law as text driven. Text has specific affordances, text is makes us to process information in sequential way, left to right, from one point to next. We can increase the ability to reflect and it stimulate criticism. The proliferation of printed text has generated a monologue. We are forced to reconsider your opinion, to reinterpret the information. And is what we take as universal values, privacy in the mind and free speech.
- Law and the rule of law are based on the idea of contest-ability. As we have to think about what it means and think about interpretations as opposed to code which is self-interpreting.
- The shift from text to code will force us to rethink our situation. We have to build the protection we want to build. It is important that we can context the rules that the legislator has put onto us.
- Legal protection by design. But there is a different between legal by design and legal protection by design (with element of contest-ability)

- The GDPR is the first legislation at the global level that has created a legal obligation for data protection law into the back end systems. If there are enough public litigation providers will also have to fix the backend and not just the front end.

Jan Middendorp, Member of Parliament NL

As an MP of the Hague, I am obliged to reap the benefits of digitization (for our inhabitants). How big data could help us make better policy? A lot of governments are struggling to get their heads around on what digitalization has to offer. Digitization is very human, its focused on human.

- Knowledge and capability are very important to get started with the digitization. The rise of social media and politics have changed. Just like businesses had to review communication strategies to deal with customers, most governments are also digitizing communication, though it's still a one way communication, a digital dialogue would be important to exchange views between inhabitants and the government.
- Although I have been part of many discussions, it has been difficult to transform discussions into reality because we are in new territorial areas. We need to find more trials to get digitization right.
- It's easy when building roads, as it is a clear procedure. With digitization we are in a new territory, we are working on a frontier, we need to execute great ideas and we have to be able to understand new ideas, especially concerning privacy.
- We need more knowledge to regulate it.
- With digitization, borders don't exist anymore. This has become more important and essential for all the policy making that we do. This is a little like the Bretton woods to get a grip on the financial world after the second world war to bring monetary and financial stability. Perhaps this conference is something like a new Bretton Woods online.

Jaya Baloo - CISO KPN

The premise is not quite right as we are talking about internet accountability and democracy. When I refer to information security at KPN, there can be no democracy and how we decide information security is decided online. There is only benevolent dictatorship. I am the dictator. The openness does not always benefit the goal we are trying to achieve.

- We have a bit of legislation but it is not enough demonstrable consistency and action, for example in the Network and Information Security Directive of the European Union, it directs many issues but it explicitly excludes the hardware and software vendors.
- We create global standards but we do not have a universal adoption framework. Where are the incentives to roll it out.
- We have norms but no path to implementation. We are in a prisoners dilemma.
- Google marks non-https as non -afe, to ensure websites to upgrade certification
- Duty of care, companies should apply a duty of care to protect employees. So, we need to have a safe place for them to notify issues without a sanctions regime.
- We need to have ways to ensure clean pipes of communication while guaranteeing privacy and net-neutrality.
- In order to have a sourcing strategy as a company or as a country, we need more technical information rather than only political ones to help us make decisions.
- We have talked about Brettons Woods, but where is the Geneva conventions when we talk about matters like this. Where do we say that actually civilian targets are not ok in the advent of a cyberwar. And if you pay attention, you will see that we are continuously dealing with issues like hijacking attempts, espionage, take down, like unlawfully, of all kinds of things. We should have an agreement on which kind of things we can act upon.
- If we pay attention, there is a world war three happening right now, only it happening on all of our digital infrastructure, its highly covert and really asymmetric, so even the small boys can play a very big game.

Boris Wojtan, Director of Privacy, GSMA

As a privacy professional, I say that Privacy is a virtuous circle. To bridge the gap, it is beyond the high level policy level, and the real world operational business decisions that have to be made from a day to day basis.

- On a provocative note, I would like to say that Jaya is probably the only person on this panel who does a real job to implement the day to day operational decisions, the rest of us are all policy and politics. Just to put that out there.
- "GSMA represents mobile operators around the world.
- Today, we are asked to talk about technology and the influence on policy. Mobile operations provide infrastructure, like all the internet traffic that you see that goes over communications networks. So that's one big thing. Our members also want to provide services on the internet, they want to provide content and they are heavily involved in the IoT space trying to create the platforms that will allow manufacturers to plug their devices, the things within the Internet of things, in that ecosystems. We work with the automobile sector to drive the connected car technology which is turning the car into a computer

technology or a mobile phone and that data has to be shipped to different places where it is needed. Our members are doing a lot to help the commercial goals and also the societal goals. With sustainable development goals, we work hard at engaging big data for social good projects.”

- We want technological innovation to happen, and it can only happen if we have a regulatory environment that enables that. From the privacy world we have that, I know GDPR is not perfect, but in high level terms, if we have legislation in place, the smart legislation that focuses on principals, that's technology neutral, sector neutral, that is focused on the risk of harm to individuals rather than being prescriptive and creating bureaucratic hurdles...
- importantly data has to be able to flow across borders. It's for large and small companies too and society needs that data in order to be able to flow so that we can have a digitally inclusive society. That the positive environment we want.
- I want to reclaim the term accountability, companies should be rewards to improve standards in accountability. It could create a culture change in organizations and at all levels. Increased awareness at all levels, to think of where the risks are and how to mitigate them. Accountability is to introduce genuine harm prevention for all individuals.
- Everyone is liable under the law.

Mr. Arthur Van der Wees (Moderator)

- Accountability is a joint-ownerships and control. Everybody owns it.
- Example from a simple perspective, we could ask ourselves, before sending a text message (in terms of accountability) two questions; 1) do I really mean it and 2) Can I defend it.
- In cyber people tend to behave differently than physically

Mårten Schultz - The Swedish Law and Internet Institute

I am working on an application with a working title insta-trial, how you can sue someone in three simple steps. Users can answer a few questions to know if something is unlawful on the internet. Whether it is a defamation, a threat, hate-speech under Swedish law. The app will provide you with law suits to print out and send to courts. Industry you two can sue. It's a joke and partly true. Most jurisdictions have experienced similar things, the criminal justice system does not work when it comes to cyberbullying, online harassment, and threats online.

- A report from the crime prevention in Sweden showed that less than 4% of the police reports regarding crimes online were even touched upon. So more than 96% of the reports led to nothing. No one even looked at it. So, we have a criminal investigation system that has pretty much left the internet. So, what can you do about it?
- The idea behind this app is that we try to open up possibilities to claim responsibility for yourself. Either you do it yourself, you do it with the help of a council, or you do it with the help of civil society, with the help of an organization. (example: women rights organization who can help with misogynistic or hate speech online for instance)
- in Sweden, we can see how criminal activities online affect elections. We see threats against politicians and journalists leaving platforms. We know that the big newspapers stay away from some subjects like migration and feminism and things like that.
- This discussion today is a good start to broaden the perspective from legal responsibility and to talk about accountability. To talk about the Interplay between legal responsibility and self-regulation.
- We need to refocus our legal strategies, we need to focus more on civil responsibility and empowerment. We need to focus more on access to justice, we need to focus more on providing people with knowledge about their rights and also, we need to money into an app.

Pavan Duggal, Chairman at International Commission on Cyber Security Law

It is a very confusing world to live in. The biggest challenge is that of attribution. How do we attribute cyber acts to state or non-state actors. What is the magical formula? Will governments be ready to consider this as credible evidence. The world by and large stands exposed. It is not only in the superficial internet but also in the deep net and the darknet. The darknet is 500 times the actual size of the superficial net. In that context, how to we developed effective policy and regulatory frameworks to help us address the challenges of anonymity that is existing online. Do we have anonymity to misuse for purposes of cybercrime, cyber terror, cyberhate? I think these are bigger questions that stakeholders have to start with right away. What is the legality of artificial intelligence? We need to start thinking of a regulatory and ethical framework around artificial intelligence and the internet of things. There is not one cyber law in place. There is a vacuum. So, countries come up with national cyber laws. The question is how to govern the global internet within the frameworks of national law. We need to put in place an international convention on cyberlaw and security.

Clarifications from the panelists

- The Hague wants to be part of the digital revolution.
- GDPR requires companies to have compliance by design for everyone who wants to compete on the European market. To create a market for tools for compliance to create a level playing field.
- We talk about values and ethics, but we need to have incentives in place

- Companies have to comply, with regulations such as GDPR, so that it's not only a discussion but an obligation for all companies.

Discussion and comments from the floor:

- Principals have to be the starting point for designing new solutions. Voluntary principals are great starting points. Values that are beyond individuals and require compliance from companies.
- "When we try to aim for compliance sometimes we fall short of security."
- "accountability does not mean going down with transparency"
- "focusing on accountability is forcing companies to step up, as the law may not always be up to speed"
- "we need a transparent methodology, rather than a ruleset"
- "accountability doesn't say much until we say who is accountable to whom and for what" and the ability to do attribution for that back to the actors so that we can protect people's rights to lawful recourse. Right now, we don't.
- "We need to talk about right to (effective) lawful recourse, if your security is violated or if your privacy is violated". We don't have it, and I am not sure the internet can be a place for everyone until we have it."
- Companies can be liable but they are not criminal. WE need news ways to access law.
- Is the difference between text and code so fundamentally different? Should we learn to read code
- there is a build in contest-ability (did I do it, does this law apply) in text, for code, there needs to be a decision and immediate interpretation which acts like a legislator and the executor at the same time. SO, we need to better understand when we need this and when we don't is important.
- How do we relate accountability and internet democracy between the global north and the global south? How to address the potential gaps and dynamics of the challenges that we are presented with to ensure social inclusion and development.
- North south divide: consequences of quantum computing that can decrypt all encryption and everything that we have transmitted. So, this is a game of who gets there first, who can afford it, and security will not be a universal right, it will be a right for those who can pay.
- There will be a lot of trial and error to get it right.
- Internet founders have always loved freedom, and dislike governmental intervention in rules and political elements
- Cloud Act 25th of March 2018 is a new step that is developing in a new space of privacy and civilians.

Rapporteurs: Rajinder Jhol, Geneva / Joe Hironaka, UNESCO