# FRAMEWORK FOR MULTISTAKEHOLDER CYBER POLICY DEVELOPMENT

# Introducing the Framework for Multistakeholder Cyber Policy Development

## The need for multistakeholder cyber policy development

Governments are recognising that internet policy issues are increasingly complex and have impact across society, economy and policy. This makes policy development all the more challenging and the considerations more broad and interrelated. This complexity warrants a more multistakeholder and expertise driven approach to policy development in which the role for stakeholders is ever more critical. More inclusive policy development processes are the key ingredient to policy development in the internet space and to the implementation of more comprehensive approaches to cyber policy and governance.

This need has been recognised in numerous cybersecurity forums and statements, including in the Chair's Statement of the 2015 Global Conference on CyberSpace (GCCS) held in The Hague, which noted: "From the beginning of the London process, through Budapest and Seoul, there has been a growing commitment to cooperation among stakeholders. Governments were urged to ensure that cyber policy at the national, regional and international level is developed through multistakeholder approaches, including civil society, the technical community, businesses and governments across the globe."[1] Multistakeholder policy development processes are proving increasingly successful – in particular the recent Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) transition that enabled the United States Government to transfer its clerical and stewardship roles in the Domain Name System to the multistakeholder community.

To realise and benefit from such approaches, policymakers first need to recognise the value of multistakeholder approaches. Such approaches can take more time and require more resources, but the end result is typically a more appropriately targeted, effective and holistic policy that will pay dividends for society, economy and policy. These benefits will come not just by encouraging stakeholders to engage, but by ensuring that the views and expertise that they bring to the table are considered and included.

## Purpose

The Framework for Multistakeholder Cyber Policy Development aims to:

1) **Set a standard** for what it means for a policy development process to be multistakeholder.

---

[1]https://www.gccs2015.com/sites/default/files/documents/Chairs%20Statement%20GCCS2015%20-%2017%20April.pdf

2) Provide a way to **measure** or determine how multistakeholder an overall policy development process is at any stage of the process.

Benchmarking and assessing multistakeholder cyber policy development processes is an essential first step towards increasing and deepening stakeholder participation in these processes, so that ultimately cyber laws, policies and regulations better address the rights and security of all.

## What is it?

The Framework consists of the following:

1) Multistakeholder characteristics – a concise representation of six key characteristics that define a multistakeholder approach and should be applied to policy development processes'. These characteristics are based on existing processes, principles and definitions from across examples of inclusive governance, multistakeholderism and enhanced co-operation.[2]
2) Policy development process – a process outline that explains the recommended stages of a multistakeholder policy development process.
3) Benchmarking tool – a tool that can be used to assess the extent to which a policy development process is multistakeholder. The tool lays out indicators for the individual characteristics to allow the user of the tool to benchmark a particular multistakeholder process.

This Framework is an evolving tool and we welcome case feedback, lessons learned and case studies on its aits application, how it has been adapted to local circumstances and requirements, and its overall implementability.

## Who's it for and how can they use it?

The Framework is for use by anyone with an interest or role in technology, governance and Internet and cyber policy. The focus is on standards and measurement, rather than tactics. This means that the Framework is flexible enough for any stakeholder to use – be they government, civil society, business, the technical community, academia or users.  It is also not intended to be a one-size fits all model  - it is expected and encouraged that users of the Framework will adapt it according to local needs.

How and why each stakeholder might use the tool will vary depending on their priorities. For example, civil society may use the Framework to identify important gaps in the cyber policy process so that they can better focus their advocacy efforts. They may also use it to demonstrate how meaningful an existing national 'multistakeholder' process actually is so that it can be improved. Governments may in turn use it as a tool for mapping and

---

[2]      See Sources in Appendix I.

implementing policy processes, for self-reflection or to showcase themselves as models for best practice.

The Framework's current focus is on cyber policy development processes at the national level because this is where laws and policies are made. It can be applied to any or all stages of the policy process (elaborated below). With some development, however, the Framework could be adapted to analyse regional and international processes to measure or demonstrate to others their progress.

## The four policy stages

Policy development involves various steps and, as such, the Framework is structured around four headline policy stages:

1) Formation: This stage establishes the protocols that will guide the policy process, including rules of engagement and mechanisms for agreeing the outputs.
2) Drafting: The number of steps within this phase will depend on the policy issue and the agreed approaches and outcomes, and could include research, mapping and consultation (public and expert).
3) Agreement: This is the phase in which the parties in the policy development process come to agreement, typically through consensus, on the policy in question. If agreed, the policy is then forwarded on to those parties who are in a position to adopt the policy (stage 4).
4) Adoption: This is the phase in the policy process where policy is adopted. Whether the mechanism for the adoption of the policy is multistakeholder or not will largely depend on the nature of the policy and the requirements for adoption.

For the first policy stage (formation) a set of key critical building blocks have also been identified. For example, common goals, a time frame and decisionmaking mechanisms need to be agreed and in place before the policy drafting occurs in order to facilitate the overall policy development process. This preparatory work – which will often result in a Charter or similar document – is essential for effective decisionmaking, procedural efficiency and good governance.

It is important to note that policy development is an iterative exercise which means that the stages are cyclical rather than linear, often being repeated several times over.

The format and time-frame of each stage will vary considerably depending on national context and the type of policy.  Importantly, the fourth stage (adoption), while listed, may or may not be multistakeholder.  The mechanism for adopting a particular policy will be more or less dependent on the nature of the policy in question.  Typically, policy that needs to become legislation will be adopted by a Parliament or legislature, which is not multistakeholder or inclusive in the sense of this Framework. Nor are the subsequent stages of implementation and evaluation included as part of this Framework.

It is essential to recognise that at each stage, the importance or role of different stakeholders may increase or decrease. For instance, when setting an agenda, breadth of views and opinions is imperative. However, actual drafting often requires depth of expertise (in particular technical expertise). What is required, therefore, is a nuanced understanding of the value of different stakeholders and practical limitations at each stage of the process.

## The six characteristics

The Framework lays out six characteristics of multistakeholder policy development that apply across all policy stages. These are:

1. Open and accessible
2. Inclusive
3. Collaborative
4. Consensus driven
5. Evidence based
6. Transparent and accountable

The Framework builds on existing best practices from the internet governance field as well as from other sectors (such as the environment and climate change) where multistakeholder approaches to policy development are more established. The selected characteristics come from a number of existing principles, processes, forums and documents relating to multistakeholder participation, multistakeholderism and enhanced cooperation, where terms and definitions are similar, but sometimes inconsistent and ill-defined. The Framework is an attempt to standardise these terms and definitions.

When compiling the six characteristics, we took into account the following considerations:

- Frequency of use: Frequently referenced terms and definitions were included on the basis that they were already widely accepted and mainstream. For example: 'transparency', 'accountability', 'open', 'accessible'.
- Distinctiveness of meaning: In several cases, terms overlapped in their meaning or were not distinct enough from one another. For example, 'inclusive and participatory'.
- Measurability: Characteristics needed to be measurable, which meant being able to properly define them by creating indicators. In this process it became clear that some terms were too broad or overlapped too much with others.
- Hierarchy: While there are only six characteristics, some terms were higher level than others and as such several terms are included as indicators rather than as high level characteristics.
- Relationship to participation: Terms were excluded if they fell outside the notion of participation. Several sources included notions and values such as 'human rights respecting', 'adaptive' or 'flexible', 'distributive ecosystems', 'responsive to

technological advance' and so on. These are standards for the field rather than what it means to have a participatory process. The exception is 'evidence-based' which was included because of the subjective nature of information and research that may be brought to the process, which is very often informed by stakeholders' own priorities.

- Clarity: Many definitions were as abstract or ambiguous as the terms they were defining. Strong definitions were drawn on for use in the framework – for example for 'transparency and accountability' – but for the most part definitions needed considerable work to add detail and to clean out ambiguous terminology.

The list of key sources can be found in Appendix I.

# FRAMEWORK FOR MULTISTAKEHOLDER CYBER POLICY DEVELOPMENT

## 1) MULTISTAKEHOLDER CHARACTERISTICS

*These are the characteristics that make a policy development process multistakeholder.*

**1** **Open and accessible**

- Open to all stakeholders

- Accessible to people of all backgrounds and abilities

All relevant/interested stakeholders are allowed to participate in the policy process. The process is advertised widely and stakeholders are given enough notice to prepare and attend. No stakeholder is excluded on the basis of their disability, language, race, religion, gender, sexuality or culture, or as a result of high financial costs, bureaucracy or location. Where there are barriers to participation, active steps are taken to overcome these. All discussions, documents and resources are in an accessible format.

**2** **Inclusive**

- Includes wide range of views and interests
- Consideration given to all inputs/contributions

All relevant stakeholder groups are actively represented in the policy process. The different views and interests within each stakeholder group are also represented. Stakeholders have equal opportunities to contribute and their contributions are given equal visibility and consideration.

**3** **Collaborative**

- Existence of common purpose

- High level of trust

Stakeholders are willing to work together and to agree on a common purpose. This common purpose is used to determine and guide the direction of the policy process and stakeholders remain committed to it throughout. Collaboration is also built through strong and trusting relationships, with ample opportunities for stakeholders to build these relationships with one another. Stakeholders work well together and there are no factions or alliances between stakeholders that undermine trust or collaboration.

**4** **Consensus driven**

- Strives for decisionmaking by consensus
- Strives for equality in decisionmaking

All decisionmaking processes and mechanisms are based on the notion of consensus. In practice, the group acts, as far as is possible, by general agreement. Stakeholders hold equal weight in decisionmaking. And all are involved or at least represented in the different levels of decisionmaking – from decisions around procedures, to inclusions in a draft, to agreeing the final document or legislation.

**5** **Evidence based**

- Draws on balanced expertise and research

- Agreement on interpretation and use of facts

Decisions are based on the evidence and facts available. Where these are contradictory, there is due time for discussion and general agreement about which facts to consider and which to exclude. The group as a whole has expertise on all of the issues relevant to the process. Where expertise is lacking, the group has access to balanced and independent expert opinion and resources. Research is carried out to ensure that all stakeholders have a baseline level of knowledge.

**6** **Transparent and accountable**

- Clarity of stakeholder interests and representation

- Existence of procedures and mechanisms

- Rigorous systems for records and disclosure

- Clear lines of accountability

From the outset, there is a set of clearly defined procedures and mechanisms for the different aspects of the policymaking process, covering issues such as stakeholder representation, stakeholder contributions, inclusion and exclusion of inputs, decisionmaking, leadership of the process, accountability and redress. The interests of all involved stakeholders are declared. And the details of discussions and decisions are documented and published. There are clear and functioning lines of accountability internally between the leadership and group, as well as externally between stakeholders and their wider communities.

## 1. Policy process formation

This stage encompasses both the establishment of protocols that will guide the policy process, including rules of engagement and mechanisms for agreeing the outputs, and the opening of the process to participants. These protocols might take the form of a Charter or similar document that the parties to the process should sign up to. Key elements to take into account include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Agreeing on a problem statement
- Establishing common goals and objectives;
- Setting milestones (or steps in process);
- Setting deliverables;
- Agreeing a timeframe;
- Agreeing on leadership for policy process;
- Agreeing on decisionmaking mechanisms.

## 2. Policy drafting

The number of steps within this phase will depend on the issue and national policymaking norms/frameworks and could include:
- Research and mapping
- Consultation (public and expert)
- Drafting
- Review
N.B. Policy drafting is not a linear process and some or all stages may be repeated several times.

## 3. Policy agreement

This is the phase of the inclusive policymaking process in which the parties in the policymaking process come to agreement, typically through consensus, on the policy in question. The policy is then forwarded on to those parties who are in a position to adopt the policy (stage 4). If the policy is not agreed then it should, subject to protocols agreed in the Formation stage, be further worked upon by the stakeholders.

## 4. Policy adoption

This is the final phase in the policy process where policy will be adopted. Whether the mechanism for the adoption of the policy is inclusive or not will largely depend on the nature of the policy and the requirements for adoption. In the case of voluntary agreements the adoption may well be executed by all those who are party to the inclusive policy development process. If the policy requires legislative implementation then adoption would rest with the government.

# FRAMEWORK FOR MULTISTAKEHOLDER CYBER POLICY DEVELOPMENT

## 3) BENCHMARKING TOOL

*This benchmarking tool helps evaluate the degree to which multistakeholder characteristics have been implemented and adhered to throughout a policy development process.*

| CHARACTERISTIC | INDICATORS | ILLUSTRATIVE ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS | POLICY PROCESS FORMATION | | POLICY DRAFTING | | POLICY AGREEMENT | | POLICY ADOPTION | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *BENCHMARK* | *EVALUATION* | *BENCHMARK* | *EVALUATION* | *BENCHMARK* | *EVALUATION* | *BENCHMARK* | *EVALUATION* |
| **1 Open and accessible** | | | | | | | | | | |
| All relevant/interested stakeholders are allowed to participate in the policy process. The process is advertised widely and stakeholders are given enough notice to prepare and attend. No stakeholder is excluded on the basis of their disability, language, race, religion, gender, sexuality or culture, or as a result of high financial costs, bureaucracy or location. If there are barriers to participation, active steps are taken to overcome these. All discussions, documents and resources are in an accessible format. | **1.1 Level of openness** | Were all stakeholders allowed to participate in the process? | | | | | | | | |
| | | Were all stakeholders notified that the process was happening? | | | | | | | | |
| | | Was there enough notice for all stakeholders to prepare and attend? | | | | | | | | |
| | **1.2 Level of accessibility** | Were there any barriers preventing stakeholders from participating? Including: financial barriers; geographical barriers; language or cultural barriers; barriers based on disability; barriers based on race, religion, gender, sexuality; bureaucratic/administrative barriers | | | | | | | | |
| | | Were provisions made so that all stakeholders could participate, and all discussions, documents and resources were accessible to everyone? | | | | | | | | |
| | | Were stakeholders who were unable to participate in person able to participate remotely? | | | | | | | | |
| **2 Inclusive** | | | | | | | | | | |
| All relevant stakeholder groups are actively represented in the policy process. The different views and interests within each stakeholder group are also represented. Stakeholders have equal opportunities to contribute and their contributions are given equal visibility and consideration. | **2.1 Range of views and interests** | Were all relevant stakeholder groups represented? | | | | | | | | |
| | | Were the different views and interests within each stakeholder group represented? | | | | | | | | |
| | **2.2 Level of consideration given to inputs** | Were all stakeholders given the opportunity to contribute? | | | | | | | | |
| | | Were opportunities to contribute equal for all stakeholders? | | | | | | | | |
| | | Were all stakeholder inputs given due consideration? | | | | | | | | |
| | | Was there justification for inclusion or exclusion of inputs? | | | | | | | | |
| | | Were all stakeholder inputs published? | | | | | | | | |
| **3 Collaborative** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Stakeholders are willing to work together and to agree on a common purpose. This common purpose is used to determine and guide the direction of the policy process and stakeholders remain committed to it throughout. Collaboration is also built through strong and trusting relationships, with ample opportunities for stakeholders to build these relationships with one another. Stakeholders work well together and there are no factions or alliances between stakeholders that undermine trust or collaboration. | **3.1 Existence of common purpose** | Did stakeholders agree on a common purpose or goal? | | | | | | | | |
| | | Did stakeholders remain committed to the common purpose? | | | | | | | | |
| | **3.2 Level of trust** | Were stakeholders able to build strong relationships with each other? | | | | | | | | |
| | | Did stakeholders work together well? | | | | | | | | |
| **4 Consensus driven** | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| All decisionmaking processes and mechanisms, are based on the notion of consensus. In practice, the group acts, as far as is possible, by general agreement. Stakeholders hold equal weight in decisionmaking, and all are involved or at least represented in the different levels of decisionmaking – from decisions around procedures, to inclusions in a draft, to agreeing the final document or legislation. | **4.1 Degree of decisionmaking by consensus** | Were agreed decisionmaking processes and mechanisms based on consensus amongst all stakeholders? | |
| | | In practice, did the group act by general agreement (consensus), as far as was possible? | |
| | **4.2 Equality of decisionmaking powers** | Did all stakeholders hold equal weight or power in decisionmaking? | |

**5 Evidence based**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Decisions are based on the evidence and facts available. Where these are contradictory, there is due time for discussion and general agreement about which facts to consider and which to exclude. The group as a whole has expertise on all of the issues relevant to the process. Where expertise is lacking, the group has access to balanced and independent expert opinion and resources. Research is carried out to ensure that all stakeholders have a baseline level of knowledge. | **5.1 Balance of expertise and research** | Did the group as a whole have expertise in ALL areas relevant to the process? | |
| | | Was relevant research conducted to support the process and give stakeholders a baseline level of knowledge? | |
| | | Where expertise was lacking, did the group have access to balanced expert opinion and resources? | |
| | **5.2 Level of agreement on interpretation and use of facts** | Did all stakeholders agree on the same interpretation of evidence and facts? | |
| | | Were all decisions based on the evidence and facts available? | |

**6 Transparent and accountable**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **6.1 Clarity of stakeholder interests and representation** | Was it clear who stakeholders represented? | |
| | | Did stakeholders declare their interests and relationships? | |
| From the outset, there is a set of clearly defined procedures and mechanisms for the different aspects of the policymaking process, covering issues such as stakeholder representation, stakeholder contributions, inclusion and exclusion of inputs, decisionmaking, leadership of the process, accountability and redress. The interests of all involved stakeholders are declared, and the details of discussions and decisions are documented and published. There are clear and functioning lines of accountability internally between the leadership and group, as well as externally between stakeholders | **6.2 Existence of procedures and mechanisms** | Was there an agreed set of mechanisms and procedures from the outset? Covering: Leadership of the process Stakeholder representation Engagement/contributions Inclusion and exclusion of inputs Decisionmaking power and methods Accountability and redress Changes | |
| | | Were agreed procedures and mechanisms meticulously followed at all times? | |
| | **6.3 Existence of systems for records and disclosure** | Were discussions and decisions fully documented? | |
| | | Were discussions and decisions fully and publicly disclosed? | |

and their wider communities.

| 6.4 | Existence of lines of accountability | Were established accountability procedures and mechanisms appropriate? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | In practice, was the leadership accountable to the group as a whole? | | | | | | | | |
| | | In practice, were stakeholders accountable to the group as a whole? | | | | | | | | |
| | | In practice, were stakeholders accountable to their respective communities? | | | | | | | | |

# Sources for the 'Framework for Multistakeholder Cyber Policy Development'

1. World Society on the Information Society – Tunis Agenda for the Information Society ([link](link))
2. Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers – Generic Names Supporting Organisation – Policy Development Process ([link](link))
3. Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers – Draft Uniform Framework for a Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) Life Cycle: Principles and Recommendations ([link](link))
4. Internet Governance Forum (IGF) 2014 – Best Practice Forum on Developing Meaningful Multistakeholder Mechanisms ([link](link))
5. NETmundial - NETmundial Multistakeholder Statement: Internet Governance Principles ([link](link))
6. Internet Rights & Principles Coalition – Charter of Human Rights and Principles for the Internet ([link](link))
7. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Principles for Internet Policy Making ([link](link))
8. Council of Europe – Declaration by the Committee of Ministers on Internet governance principles ([link](link)).
9. African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedoms ([link](link))
10. Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group on Internet Governance ([link](link))
11. Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict – Multistakeholder Processes for Conflict Prevention and Peace-building: A Manual ([link](link))
12. The MSP Guide: How to Design and Facilitate Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships ([link](link))
13. Regional Internet Registries
14. Internet Society – Internet Governance: Why the Multistakeholder Approach Works ([link](link))
15. Association for Progressive Communications (APC) – APC Internet Rights Charter ([link](link))
16. World Summit on Sustainable Development (Earth Summit 2002) - Multi-Stakeholder Processes: A Methodological Framework ([link](link))

### 1. World Society on the Information Society – Tunis Agenda for the Information Society ([link](link))

The World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) Tunis Agenda was the official outcome and consensus statement of the WSIS, adopted on 18 November 2005. The WSIS – which took place in two phases in 2003 (in Geneva) and 2005 (in Tunis) – brought together a broad range of stakeholders including heads of state and government, government ministers, and representatives of international organisations, the private sector and civil society. The Tunis Agenda set out the agreed vision for internet governance as agreed by the stakeholders involved.

### 2. Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers – Generic Names Supporting Organisation – Policy Development Process ([link](link))

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is a non-profit organisation that is responsible for coordinating the maintenance and procedures of several databases related to the namespaces of the Internet, including Top-Level Domains. Within ICANN, the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) is one of three supporting organisations and is responsible for fashioning and recommending changes to policies for generic Top-Level Domains (such as .com, .org and .biz). The GNSO determines its policy following its Policy Development Process, which it considers "a very open, transparent, and inclusive manner (…) [with] multiple opportunities for any interested person or entity to comment on the issues".

NB: The Policy Development Process as such, is not described beyond the formal process (and does not make reference to the values underpinning the process). The references in the "Principles and Sources" document come from the ICANN Bylaws which govern all ICANN activity and make reference to policy making.

3. **Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers – Draft Uniform Framework for a Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) Life Cycle: Principles and Recommendations ([link](#))**

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is a non-profit organisation that is responsible for coordinating the maintenance and procedures of several databases related to the namespaces of the internet, including Top-Level Domains. Within ICANN, the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) is a mechanism which allows any number of ICANN's Supporting Organizations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs) to work together to address issues that are of common interest and do not fall within the sole remit of one SO or AC. The Draft Uniform Framework was designed to provide a general and shared framework for the establishment, operation and closure of CCWGs.

4. **Internet Governance Forum (IGF) 2014 – Best Practice Forum on Developing Meaningful Multistakeholder Mechanisms ([link](#))**

The Internet Governance Forum (IGF) is a multi-stakeholder platform that facilitates the discussion of public policy issues pertaining to the Internet. Established following the WSIS in 2003 and 2005, its annual meetings bring together governments, the private sector and civil society, including the technical and academic community. Following a report produced by the UN General Assembly Economic and Social Council Working Group on Improvements to the IGF which called for the development of more tangible outputs to "enhance the impact of the IGF on global Internet governance and policy", the IGF developed an intersessional programme of Best Practice Forums (BPFs) intended to complement other IGF community activities. The outputs from this programme are intended to become robust resources, to serve as inputs into other pertinent forums, and to evolve and grow over time. In 2014, a BPF on Developing Meaningful Mechanisms was established, comprising experts from government, business, civil society and the academic and technical communities who developed through open mailing lists and online virtual meetings, a report on Developing Meaningful Multi-stakeholder Mechanisms.

5. **NETmundial - NETmundial Multistakeholder Statement: Internet Governance Principles ([link](#))**

The NETMundial – Global Multistakeholder Meeting on the Future of Internet Governance was a meeting that took place in Brazil in 2004. The meeting brought together representatives of governments, civil society, the private sector, academia and the technical community to establish strategic guidelines related to the use and development of the internet in the world. Specifically, the goal of the meeting was to develop two documents: (i) principles of internet governance and (ii) a roadmap for future development of the internet governance ecosystem.

6. **Internet Rights & Principles Coalition – Charter of Human Rights and Principles for the Internet ([link](#))**

The Internet Rights and Principles Coalition works "to uphold human rights on the internet and to root internet governance processes and systems in human rights standards" and aims to "promote, and provide a space for multi-stakeholder dialogue and collaboration" and "to be an umbrella platform for facilitating collaboration on human rights issues in the Internet Governance Forum process". The Coalition was formed during the IGF in 2008 after a merger of the Internet Bill of Rights and Framework of Principles for the Internet coalitions, later joined by the Freedom of Expression Coalition. The Coalition comprises 320 participants from government departments, intergovernmental organisations, the private sector, civil society organisations, individuals, academics and the technical community. Between 2009 and 2011, following an online and offline "collabowriting" exercise, open to all members of the new coalition, the Charter of Human Rights and Principles for the Internet was developed. Coalition members discussed and contributed to the drafting process at all stages. The final draft was opened for wider consultation within the IGF and by external commentators before finalisation. The Charter was revised at the UNESCO First WSIS+10 Review Meeting in 2013.

7. **Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Principles for Internet Policy Making ([link](#))**

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is an intergovernmental economic organisation with 35 member countries, founded in 1961 to stimulate economic progress and world trade. It is

a forum of countries describing themselves as committed to democracy and the market economy, providing a platform to compare policy experiences, seeking answers to common problems, identify good practices and coordinate domestic and international policies of its members.

In 2011, the OECD community came together, through a multi-stakeholder process, to draw on the experiences of the participants in good practice for internet policy and governance. Following this, the OECD produced a Recommendation on Internet Policy Making Principles which has been adopted by all member states.

8. **Council of Europe – Declaration by the Committee of Ministers on Internet governance principles ([link](link))**

The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe comprises the Foreign Affairs Ministers of all the member states of the Council if Europe (or their permanent diplomatic representatives). It is both a governmental body, where national approaches to problems facing European society can be discussed, and a collective forum, where Europe-wide responses to such challenges are formulated. In collaboration with the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, it is the guardian of the Council's fundamental values, and monitors member states' compliance with their undertakings. In 2011, the Committee adopted a Declaration containing a set of internet governance principles.

9. **African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedoms ([link](link))**

The African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedoms is a Pan-African initiative to promote human rights standards and principles of openness in Internet policy formulation and implementation on the continent. The Declaration is intended to elaborate on the principles which are necessary to uphold human and people's rights on the Internet, and to cultivate an Internet environment that can best meet Africa's social and economic development needs and goals.

10. **Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group on Internet Governance ([link](link))**

The Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group on Internet Governance (MAGIG) was established in 2013 to support UK policy-making on internet governance issues by allowing multi-stakeholder input into UK policy for a number of international meetings and conferences dealing with internet governance issues. It is chaired by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport but is also attended by other relevant government departments. The MAGIG has around thirty members comprising government departments, the UK's telecommunications regulator (OFCOM), businesses, civil society organisations and academics.

11. **Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict – Multistakeholder Processes for Conflict Prevention and Peace-building: A Manual ([link](link))**

This manual was drafted by the Preventative Action Working Group of the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC). The Working Group has, since 2009, brought together civil society organisations and practitioners from around the world to reflect on how to bridge the gap between conflict early warning and early response, to better understand the roles and contributions of civil society in this respect, and to equip practitioners with know-how and lessons learned in how to play their role effectively. The manual was developed following a review of existing resources in the fields of conflict prevention, peacebuilding and organisational development and the input of GPPAC members, partners and colleagues.

12. **The MSP Guide: How to Design and Facilitate Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships ([link](link))**

The MSP Guide is a book written by five multi-stakeholder partnership experts (Herman Brouwer, Jim Woodhill, Dr. Minu Hemmati, Karèn Verhoosel and Simone van Vugt) and is based on the annual three-week international course on facilitating MSPs and social learning run by the Centre for Development Innovation.

13. **Regional Internet Registries**

There are five regional internet registries which manage the allocation and registration of internet number resources within a particular region of the world. Each of which has produced its own Policy Development Process:

- The African Network Information Center ([link](link))
- The American Registry for Internet Numbers ([link](link))
- The Asia-Pacific Network Information Centre ([link](link))
- The Latin America and Caribbean Network Information Centre ([link](link))
- The Réseaux IP Européens Network Coordination Centre ([link](link))

### 14. Internet Society – Internet Governance: Why the Multistakeholder Approach Works ([link](link))

The Internet Society is an international organisation founded in 1992 to provide leadership in Internet-related standards, education, access, and policy. Its declared mission is "to promote the open development, evolution and use of the Internet for the benefit of all people throughout the world". It has a membership base of more than 140 organisations and more than 80,000 individual members.

### 15. Association for Progressive Communications (APC) – APC Internet Rights Charter ([link](link))

The Association for Progressive Communications, founded in 1990, is an international network of organisations, and describes its mission as "empower[ing] and support[ing] organisations, social movements and individuals in and through the use of information and communication technologies to build strategic communities and initiatives for the purpose of making meaningful contributions to equitable human development, social justice, participatory political processes and environmental sustainability". The APC Internet Rights Charter was drafted in 2001/02 by APC members and partner organisations at "internet rights" workshops held in Europe, Asia, Latin America and Africa. The Charter was revised in November 2006.

### 16. World Summit on Sustainable Development (Earth Summit 2002) - Multi-Stakeholder Processes: A Methodological Framework ([link](link))

The World Summit on Sustainable Development was convened by the United Nations in 2002, bringing together leaders from business and non-governmental organisations to discuss sustainable development by the United Nations. Leading up to the Summit, in 2001, the United Nations Environment and Development Forum convened a meeting of 85 representatives of stakeholder groups (including UN agencies, governments, business, trade unions, local government, NGOs, women, youth, farmers, the education community, faith communities and the media) from around the world met for a workshop on multi-stakeholder processes. They agreed to develop a methodological framework for multi-stakeholder processes around intergovernmental bodies which was finalised in 2002.