





Institute for Research and Debate on Governance

Civil Society Intervention  
in the Reform of Global Public Policy

Proceedings from the IRG / Ford Foundation International Seminar  
Paris, 17-18-19th of April 2007



# Table of Contents

Introduction	p. 7
<b>I. Advocacy Strategies</b>	
Advocacy Strategies towards the Reform of International Financial Institutions, <i>by Michael B. Likosky</i>	p. 21
Review of the debates	p. 37
<b>II. The International Taxation Campaign</b>	
Introduction to Innovative Sources of Financing for Development, <i>by Coordination Sud</i>	p. 47
Review of the debates	p. 61
<b>III. Information and Communication Technology Campaigns</b>	
The Politics and Issues of Internet Governance, <i>by Milton L. Mueller</i>	p. 71
Global Civil Societies And WSIS: Actors, Visions, Methods and Strategies... Towards what Governance? <i>by Veronique Kleck</i>	p. 79
Review of the Debates	p. 87



## Introduction

For several years, global civil society has become involved in an increasingly direct way in contributing to the elaboration of new public policies nationally and internationally. The presence of civil society organizations, for example as integral parts of the Australian and New-Zealander government delegations at UN conferences, or its input towards UN events such as the World Summit on Information Society illustrates the demand for civic engagement in the elaboration of public policy decisions. At an international meeting hosted by the Institute for Research and Debate on Governance (IRG) and funded by the Ford Foundation, thirty academics and global social activists involved in a variety of global public policy debates met to compare notes on how they influence public policy and make their voices heard within the global public arena. While participants were involved in many different campaigns the seminar used three major public policy campaigns at varying stages of development to illustrate a wide variety of civic approaches to influencing global public policy.

In order to direct the participants, IRG and Ford offered Professor Jan Aart Scholte's definition of global civil society: 'global civil society exists when civic groups deal with cross-border questions, use transnational modes of communication, are international in structure and/or have as a premise cross-border solidarity<sup>1</sup>.' Global civil society therefore involves both worldwide networks mobilized around a localized issue and local organizations united around global issues. The 'global' aspect of these organizations comes from their structure as well as their aims.

The seminar allowed for debate and exchange on strategies used by civic activists in three specific campaigns: the campaign for the reform of the International Financial Institutions (hereafter referred to as the IFI Campaign), the campaign for the creation of an International Tax (referred to as the International Tax Campaign), and the campaign to improve governance arrangements on the internet and communication technologies (hereafter referred to as the ICT campaign). These campaigns were chosen because they are a) at different stages of maturity b) are each engaging with institutions and issues not well understood by the general public and c) involve a wide variety of global actors that must be confronted with the public impact of the governance arrangements they are making. IRG commissioned four papers on the campaigns to stimulate discussion. These

<sup>1</sup> Translation from: Jan Aart Scholte "Qu'est ce que la société civile mondiale?", *Courrier de la Planète*, N°63.

papers were circulated beforehand for participants to study. IRG also interviewed all participants beforehand to identify their learning needs. In the first plenary, participants studied the interview material and identified common questions, tensions and concerns that often arise in global campaigns. These issues were:

- Building coalitions, coordinating networks and setting up alliances. Civil society is both competitive and heterogeneous. Coordination and coalition building is complicated by these characteristics. When is a coalition really valuable? How do you integrate global partners from North and South in a coalition? What type of actors should be involved?
- Working with academia and think tanks. How do you build bridges between academic expertise and the needs of activists? How can academics usefully supply a theoretical approach, address the pressure to publish, and add weight to the advocacy process?
- Engaging the media. How do you popularize an advocacy issue without oversimplifying it? What types of actors can use (or not) media exposure in their campaign?
- Methods and orientation of successful advocacy strategies. How do you deal with the tension between confrontation and collaboration with the actors targeted by the campaign? What kind of actors should you try to reach (individuals or institutions?)
- Overcoming challenges. How can we address unequal resource distribution amongst activists working in the same campaign, the tensions between short and long term objectives, the need to generate action in at least two if not three political arenas (global, national and local). How can we assess the validity of the chosen advocacy arena? What can be done to address the failure to learn from past campaigns?

In small group discussions throughout the seminar, participants discussed these issues and more specific questions and concerns within the campaigns. Each small group had participants from each campaign, activists from other global campaigns not under review and analysts from academia or think tanks. The seminar took place in English and French with simultaneous translation.

This booklet provides a summary of key lessons, an overview of the discussion on each campaign, the commissioned papers and a synthesis of the discussions surrounding each campaign. The syntheses are



structured around the questions above, trying to bring into light innovations tested by each campaign. The following mind-map shows the five groups of questions that participants generated in more detail. These questions are generic to many global public policy campaigns.

## **What did we learn from the seminar?**

While participants reported learning a great deal about their own practice as global activists, there were a few wide-ranging issues that pertained to many global public policy campaigns. These are summarized here.

Addressing diversity within global civil society. Diversity is both a challenge and an opportunity in global campaigns – diversity of actors, of strategies, of visions and of hoped-for outcomes. Within each campaign diversity was discussed as creating difficulties, but it is often a strength. Different types of social action and actors are critical of some policy components in a social change process. Pressure is generated by mobilization, often undertaken by social movement leaders. Negotiation (and inevitably compromise) with the targeted institution is often undertaken by NGOs. It is also necessary to allow for achievable gains, renewing social activists' energy and for setting a pathway toward the ultimate goal. Academia and think tanks have the capability to make the impossible seem possible and to undertake research that carries more weight than the knowledge embedded in movements and NGOs. Moreover, Academia can also take on the responsibility to analyze the successes and failures of a campaign, help activists by alerting them to what has proved effective in past campaigns and by drawing lessons from the experience. In short, multiple sets of actors are necessary to create social change. Getting everyone to work in harmony is a huge undertaking. Recognizing the different roles and negotiating through them to come to terms on the different objectives is important to the success of any campaign or movement. Recognizing this diversity as a precondition to long and short-term success is useful for global social activists. The act of recognizing the need for diverse approaches and actors in and of itself can alleviate tensions within coalitions. Negotiations between those who would rather protest and those who will want to walk the corridors of power are not a luxury – it is a necessary campaign step.

Although campaigning is supposed to be a collective venture, the way personal relationships play out between campaigners and decision-makers should not be neglected. The notion of direct influence

### **Methods and orientation of successful advocacy strategies**

- How do we define the «success» and the “effectiveness» of our activities?
- Is the aim to lobby individuals or institutions? What are the different strategies that one employs for each?
- Are we in the business of creating strong institutional arrangements or is it an unintentional consequence of advocacy strategy?
- Do inside and outside strategies invalidate both or strengthen each?
- How do we keep a critical ability as we collaborate?
- What is the strategic use of leaked information?

### **Engaging the Media, mobilizing public opinion**

- What type of actors need media exposure in their campaigns?
- Public opinion: an ambiguous ally?
- How to effectively engage the media and have them advocate our issues?
- What critical distance in relation to the media?
- Line between «media industry» and «media vs communications»?
- Reach the media as an objective in itself?
- What is the role of the Web 2.0 and its designing for advocacy strategies?
- How to popularize without oversimplifying the issues of the campaign?

### **Building coalitions, coordinating networks, setting up alliances**

- How can a coalition have in mind local voices?
- How do you manage a balanced North-South coalition?
- How do you deal with competitive NGOs in a small political space?
- How to equalize responsibilities and tasks of the members?
- What types of partners should be targeted? Any successful partnership with the private sector?
- How can we make a coalition last?
- How to work more cooperatively and get advocates to hunt «outside of their boxes»?
- Who decides the agenda?

- What criteria for excluding some actors? How to deal with co-opted actors?
- What are the intercultural challenges of supra-national networks in terms of their tools of communication?
- Who is legitimate? what type of representativity does a network have?

### **Definition of network / coalition/ alliance?**

- How to balance different ideologies in a network?
- Working with Academia and think tanks
- When and why is the relationship with Academia valuable?
- Think tanks: Caught between influence and dependence on public institutions?
- How do we identify innovative academic structures and imagine a more institutional collaboration?
- Can we consider academic programs as a framework for long-term changes and the diffusion of new ideas?
- How do practitioners inform and respond to academics?
- How to ensure that «public good» is the center of the work of Academia?
- What accountability/responsibility of researchers and their sources of data?
- How to take into account the emerging expertise from the South?
- What space for the students?
- What kind of expertise outside Academia?
- How to measure the Adequacy btw/ issues of the NGOs and what Academia can provide?

### **Overcoming challenges**

- Do short term incremental policy changes run the risk of undermining long term objectives?
- How can we assess the value and the validity of the arena in which we practice advocacy?
- How do we address the resource imbalance between advocacy targets and advocates themselves? What is your funding strategy (public / private)?
- Articulate local/national action and international involvement?  
How do we learn and understand from past campaigns?

was often raised during the seminar. There was a permanent, implicit debate among the campaigners, between strategies of collaboration and strategies of confrontation. As noted above, sorting through these tensions early and often can strengthen a campaign immeasurably.

While global civil society is diverse, a common culture of campaigning is gradually emerging. Given the extraordinary variety of participants in the seminar, coming from Asia, Latin and North America and Europe, one could explain differences in strategies by cultural differences. This explanation rarely proved correct. Through the various channels of communication, networks, alliances, a common culture of campaigning is gradually emerging. Moreover, strong differences existed within the same geo-cultural areas on e.g. information strategies (withhold information vs. speak to the media) or the comparative merits of violence/ rowdy demonstrations vs. cultivating dialogue, etc.

Surprisingly, global campaigns can be carried out primarily and successfully at a national level. The global campaign for international taxation was, and is, primarily a national level campaign. This campaign has been successful in motivating a handful of countries into levying this tax. It is also a campaign that had government champions from its earliest stages (as did the campaign to ban landmines). When governments are willing to take on the issue, the role of the activists is to keep up the pressure (i.e. protest and media strategies at national level), to firm up the outcomes through negotiation with the government at national level, and to build coalitions in other countries through civil society. This will help the government find other governmental partners or allies. While these activities are not exceptional they are easier to undertake when a government is willing to champion an issue internationally.

Considering the age and maturity of a campaign can help activists learn from each other. The IFI Campaign is over 20 years old, and is now actually multiple campaigns housed within a very loose coalition. Over the years the campaign has developed special initiatives and strategies to cope with new challenges arising from the institutions targeted. While issues have not changed (environmental protection, minority rights and pro-poor policies being three of the most important) the targets of the campaign have been extended to all forms of international banking (public, private, regional and national), regional monetary funds and trade agreements to keep pace with the myriad

financial institutions growing under globalization. At the opposite end of the spectrum, relatively “new” campaigns such as International Taxation have developed innovative tools and innovative modes of collaboration with institutions that may be of interest to older campaigns. Understanding that different courses are suited to different maturity levels of a campaign can only happen when activists have the opportunity to listen and learn from other activists who work on entirely different issues. While academia (i.e. universities) could play a mustering role and act as a conveyor belt of knowledge between different types of activists, it rarely does. Activists lack the patience to develop relations with universities; incentives within the university system are not oriented toward real-time engagement with activists; and activists are not seen as useful or influential public policy partners by academics.

Mobilizing public opinion as a central strategic campaign tool is not well understood. The subtle use of leaked information, the difficult process of negotiation and collaboration can often be impeded by a strong outside strategy of public mobilization, and a lack of coordination between “inside” and “outside” strategies.

With the Doha round stymied, the IMF losing its legitimacy, the advent of a security paradigm, the rise of economic power within Middle Income Countries and many global issues still high on the public agenda (like climate change) many participants felt the time was ripe for an overview on global governance. The links connecting different campaigns while precious little information circulated between them made many participants call for increased liaison between campaigning areas. The necessity for each campaigner to “think outside the box” appeared as a key element of the debate. Many participants confessed, after the seminar, that they discovered “new frontiers” by getting to know other global public policy campaigns that are not ‘their issue.’

## **Overview of the Three Campaigns**

### **IFI campaigns**

#### ***Overview of the questions***

Advocacy led by civil society organizations in relation to IFIs is generally based on two principles. The first is the necessity for internal reforms, when activists advocate reforms to the system of representation, increased transparency, the decentralization of decisions, protection for the environment, the poor and minority communities. The second is the necessity for change in the relations between these institutions and their partners, promoted by development activists. They call into question the conditionality approach applied to countries of the South, challenge such conceptions of governance and international cooperation and conclude with the need for real accountability of the financial institutions before the United Nations agencies. The IFI campaign has been relatively successful in the former and has found the latter more difficult to influence. Civic activists have won changes in policies on transparency, accountability, participation, some conditionalities negatively impacting on health and education services, environment, indigenous peoples and cultural heritage. They have also won debt concessions. They have not achieved UN monitoring, or changes in governance structures towards empowering Southern governments.

There are three main types of activists involved in IFI reforms: environmental, developmental and political economists. The questions that arose from the seminar began with the very nature of the campaigns and ended in trying to understand how to work with media (both new and old forms) and/or to engage the public.

Does there exist – given the diversity of objectives – a consensus between different civil society actors? Is there a homogenous global movement for the promotion of reforms or are the efforts of these civil society organizations observably concentrated at the national level? What is the relationship between the global and national political spheres constantly evoked in these campaigns? What link do civil society actors make between their local experiences in the field and international-level reform? What are the main targets of civil society organizations in this movement? How do they approach institutional representatives and what types of collaboration are created? With

regards to such a subject, how can civil society usefully mobilize the media and become a requisite source of information for them? How can CSOs manage to familiarize the public with an area that can seem largely structural and far remote from the daily lives of the majority of the population? Are national governments legitimate and useful targets and in what sense can they play a role in advancing these reforms?

The IFI section begins with a study by Michael Likosky who examines the many actors and tools mobilized around IFI reform. The ensuing discussion highlights the advocacy methods that directly target the international institutions.

### ***The international taxation campaign***

The idea of international taxes is not new. Economists, associations and social movements such as the *ATTAC (Association pour une Taxation des Transactions financières pour l'Aide au Citoyens)* movement have strived to popularize the idea of financial exchange taxes, such as the Tobin tax. Others have promoted global environmental taxes and taxes on arms sales. Economic and financial globalization, the development of international inequalities and the awareness of the limits and the fragility of the environment have re-launched the debate on the necessity for an international tax system. It involves, on the one hand increasing international solidarity transfers and the financing of world public goods; and on the other, inciting economic actors to adopt behaviors compatible with the general good. Many global public policy advocates see taxes as a natural source of funding to address global problems.

In one area, the concept of an international tax has been applied. Resources that have come from public aid toward development, will not suffice to finance the ambitions of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in areas as varied as education, health, food, access to clean water and shelter. Some leaders have thus proposed to study the creation of 'innovative financing' for development which has generated much interest in international taxation – an idea that was previously a taboo subject amongst governments. Agreement from the General Assembly of the United Nations in 2004-2005, enabled substantial studies, the formation of an inter-governmental group of around 50 states, and a pilot tax on air transport to

<sup>2</sup> Reports from the working group on Internet Governance, <http://www.wgig.org/docs/WGIGREPORT.pdf> June 2005.

be tested in 10 states. This success in the space of a few years is nevertheless extremely fragile, encountering strong opposition from the great majority of OECD countries and most economic blocs. In this context it is therefore important to discern how different civil society actors have organized to weigh in on the debate.

Henri Rouillé d'Orfeuil presented a paper on this issue in the seminar. The ensuing discussions looked at the role of NGOs and specialized networks such as the Tax Justice Network, ATTAC, Stamp out or WEED; the role of NGO networks from the countries concerned such as Brazil and France; and the important role of NGO national platforms in championing this cause. These different organizations articulated their work with research teams, published reports, launched information initiatives, organized seminars during World Social Forums and attended governmental meetings (such as the follow-up groups in Brasilia and Oslo).

### ***Governance of information and communication technologies (ICT)***

The campaign to improve governance arrangements for the internet and new communication information technologies includes two distinct aspects. The first consists of campaigns on the necessity for a real governance of the Internet, which solidified during the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) into a demand for 'the development and application by governments, the private sector, and civil society, each in their respective roles, of common principles, norms, decision-making rules of procedure and programs which model and regulate the evolution and the use of the Internet<sup>2</sup>.'

The second aspect is the actual use of the Internet as a tool to reinforce civil society advocacy strategies within campaigns. This last aspect overlaps many themes discussed at the seminar. However we have been mainly concerned here with the first aspect: campaigns for the regulation of the internet at the global level.

Within the regulatory campaigns, there are multiple advocacy issues:

- Firstly, the technical aspect: negotiations on the control of root servers, domain names, calling into question monopolies like the Corporation of Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) etc.
- Secondly, the legal and financial dimension: promotion of free software, advocacy actions in relation to the lack of protection, or the copyrighting of individual creativity, generally oriented toward the World Organization for Intellectual Property (WIPO).



- Finally, the political aspect: facilitation of the access of citizens to ICTs; the appropriation of instruments notably involving citizen participation in the production of information; privacy rights; creation of community media; and the needs and rights of a non-commercial internet community.

This campaign is the youngest of the three analyzed in the seminar. Thus far it has succeeded in creating an ongoing multi-stakeholder forum called the Internet Governance Forum, to continue to debate the issues. Activists are divided on their understanding of the importance of the Forum.

Two papers were prepared on this campaign; one by Veronique Kleck and one by Milton Mueller. Participants analyzed how differently civil society actors position themselves and assess their tools for intervention. Most of the focus of this community of activists has been on advocacy surrounding the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) including the process of prep-coms (multi-actor preparatory meetings), and the two phases of the Summit - 2003 in Geneva and 2005 in Tunis. The differences in the positions of civil society actors vis-à-vis international organizations ranges from collaboration to opposition. Another form of intervention under consideration concerns more directly the action of these organizations vis-à-vis national governments, notably in relation to national intellectual property policy and the regulation of these technologies (e.g. the French law "informatique et liberté" ).

What follows in this report are the four papers prepared by activists and scholars on the campaigns and an overview of the seminar discussion on each campaign. The IFI campaign is presented first, followed by the international tax campaign and then the internet and communication technologies. The campaigns were presented in this order to reflect their levels of maturity. The IFI campaign is over twenty-five years old. The international tax campaign is a decade old and the campaign to improve governance arrangements on the internet and communication technologies is in its infancy.



## **I. Advocacy Strategies**



# Advocacy Strategies towards the Reform of International Financial Institutions

by Michael B. Likosky<sup>3</sup>

## Introduction

This report summarizes several key aspects of internationally-oriented non governmental organizations' (NGOs) advocacy campaigns targeting International Financial Institutions (IFIs) (World Bank Group, International Monetary Fund, African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Investment Bank, and Inter-American Development Bank). It provides an overview of the issues in hand and how they are approached strategically with case studies. To do this, it relies mainly on English-language, publicly available information offered by NGOs.

The report is divided into three sections. First, it sets out the main items on the NGOs' agenda. Next, it focuses on NGO's operational strategies, discussing instruments and processes and making use of illustrative examples. Thirdly, it presents two case studies in which strategies unfold within ongoing campaigns: (1) the IFI disclosure policy campaign by the Global Transparency Initiative and (2) the campaign targeting the Inter-American Development Bank's Camisea natural gas pipeline in Peru.

## Issues in hand

NGO strategies focus on either internal or external reforms. Internal reforms involve IFI governance, whereas external ones address the impact of IFIs on the broader political and environmental landscape. Fundamentally, internal reforms may either lay the groundwork for external reforms or themselves be a result of successful external campaigns. A number of NGOs combine internal and external strategies. However, groups often focus on one category or a sub-category. This section briefly sets forth the main areas of reform.

<sup>3</sup> School of Law, School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London & Global Crystal Eastman Research Fellow, Hauser Global Law School Program, New York University School of Law (2006-7).

Internal reforms focus on the governance of IFIs. The issues include transparency, accountability and democracy/participation. These issues blend into one another in practice, e.g. meaningful accountability depends upon transparency. Further related themes include gender issues, board reform, complaint response system, and disclosure of payments to governments.

NGOs identify wide-ranging external reforms. These may target a policy or a project, or encompass a cross-section. Three common areas are (1) projects, (2) debt relief, and (3) structural adjustment.

Projects encompass extractive industries (oil, gas, mining), power, dams, and transportation. NGOs aim to ensure that projects address concerns such as displacement, the environment, human rights, participation, indigenous rights, dispute resolution, and information disclosure. Important NGO success stories involve the establishment of the World Commission on Dams and the World Bank's Inspection Panel. An important distinction exists between public and privatized projects. The trend has been towards privatized ones and the distinction has important implications for the nature of NGO strategies.

Many individual NGOs and networks of NGOs focus on debt. They have succeeded in grabbing high profile media attention and in influencing government action at the highest levels. Most organizations aim for complete debt write-off. Campaigns are ongoing.

NGOs also focus on structural adjustment programs initiated in the aftermath of financial crises. NGOs mobilize media coverage of, among other things, the impact of conditionalities placed upon IFI financial packages premised in part on the so-called Washington Consensus. Conditionalities include mandates to privatize, cuts in social spending and a host of other specific programs.

Importantly, these external campaigns do not occur in isolation from one another. For example, privatization conditionalities overlap with the shift towards privatized projects. This then leads to a series of additional externally-oriented campaigns, many of which are transversal.

Given space constraints, this report cannot summarize all campaigns. Instead, a list follows: aid, citizen involvement, currency speculation, democratization, the environment (global warming, renewable energy), forestry, gender, health and education, HIV/AIDS, human rights, IMF poverty impact assessment, indigenous rights, information disclosure, knowledge bank (World Bank), land rights, lending

priority, NGO dialogue, pesticide use, post-conflict resolution, poverty reduction, sectors, and use of experts. The importance of these issues should be obvious. Moreover, these campaigns feed into other internal and external campaigns. One success has been to bring issues into the mainstream, e.g. gender.

As we turn to how NGOs approach these issues strategically, it is important to keep in mind that each campaign has, thematically, different goals, which necessarily engender distinct strategies, commonalities notwithstanding. For example, the targets of debt campaigns differ from project to project. Although common actors exist, each campaign involves individual ones. Also, campaigns adopt distinct stances towards governments, sometimes focusing on different institutions within the state.

## **Methodology**

NGOs use a range of strategies. Many apply throughout, while others are tailored to the needs of specific campaigns. This section provides an overview of strategic issues, relating to tactics and processes. These issues are: (1) the extent to which movements are internationally-constituted or nationally-oriented; (2) the level of action, i.e. regional, local, or grassroots; (3) the actors and targets; (4) the role of public opinion and its degree of mobilization; (5) how remote issues are made relevant to the public; (6) extent to which a government is a legitimate and effective target capable of addressing reforms; (7) how IFIs are approached, i.e. direct to officials (lobbying), collaboration, etc.; and (8) tools used, i.e. 'name and shame' vs. 'quiet diplomacy'. Each of these strategic issues raises difficult questions regarding typology, measurement, and evaluation. Given space constraints, this section offers mainly impressionistic observations. It aims to highlight points of divergence and commonality among strategies. In an effort to ground the discussion, ample use is made of examples. In the hope of providing some idea of how many of these different strategic issues interact in the context of specific campaigns, the following section will provide two extended case studies.

### ***International movements or range of national movements***

This report focuses mainly on international NGOs. However, such organizations join forces with other NGOs and more nationally-oriented groups to mount campaigns. NGOs partner with and lend strategic resources to local groups.

Network-based movements work across a set of issues and partner with other organizations. At the same time, the term 'network' may cover different types of NGO groupings; networks may have free-standing institutional structures with permanent staff. Three networks that cover transversal issues are: 50 Years Is Enough, Global Transparency Initiative, IFI Watchers Network, and Social Watch. Many networks are regionally based, e.g. Citizens Network on Essential Services (Latin America and South Africa), CEE Bankwatch Network (Central and Eastern Europe), EURODAD (Europe), and Network on Debt and Development (Africa). Another possibility is the establishment of a federal structure, like Friends of the Earth (71 national groups).

An NGO might be freestanding but join with others to address specific issues. For example, Amazon Watch works with indigenous and environmental groups. Similarly, the Bank Information Center partners with other NGOs and local groups. Christian Aid privileges as a matter of principle the partnering with Southern organizations for the purpose of developing local capacity. A transversal group, Gender Action, aims to work with other NGOs to incorporate gender analysis into IFI policy-making. International partnerships may take the form of publishing Southern voices, as is the case with CHOIKE.

### ***Level of action, i.e. regional, local or grassroots***

Most NGOs work at multiple levels of action, countering negative effects of decisions taken at the international level on local communities and issues. NGOs may contribute to preexisting local movements. The theme of building local capacity informs the strategies and processes of many NGOs, e.g. ActionAid, AFRODAD, Amazon Watch, Bank Information Center. NGOs offer strategic advice and institutional infrastructure, e.g. Center for International Environmental Law provides legal assistance in accessing dispute panels. In addition, campaigns may be organized on a regional level (see networks above).



### **Actors and targets**

Targets and actors are campaign-dependent. For example, a regional European grouping, like CEE Bankwatch Network, targets European institutions, e.g. the European Investment Bank and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Similarly, the NGO Forum on the ADB, as its name suggests, focuses on the Asian Development Bank. Thematically, organizations like Christian Aid and Forest Peoples Program might, in pursuit of making IFIs accountable to the UN via the Millennium Development Goals, focus on a set of UN institutions overlooked by others. A brief look at debt and project campaigns highlights target differences.

Debt campaigns are not solely IFI-oriented. States have many creditors, thus NGOs target multiple actors. For example, besides the specific debtor countries, actors involved include foreign governments, the G8, the Paris Club, and private banks. NGOs coordinate strategies targeting multiple institutions simultaneously. This approach stems from the coordination of creditor institutions.

Project/campaigns also involve the coordination of actors. However, there is an overlap of actors across campaigns; some institutions implicated in debt are different from those involved in the projects. For example, projects involve not only local and foreign governments generically, but specific national export credit agencies and insurance entities as well as private banks, corporations, and shareholders. Institutions vary from project to project, e.g. different IFIs and export agencies.

### ***What is the role of public opinion and to what degree is it mobilized towards institutional reform***

One way that NGOs contribute to campaigns is through adept use of the media. Even the most casual observer of debt and project campaigns sees the issues in part through the lens of NGO campaigns. For some, NGO websites are undoubtedly a first port of call in an attempt to understand an issue. This subsection focuses on several ways in which NGOs aim to use public opinion to influence IFI reform: (1) documentation and analysis, (2) helping local communities to influence public opinion, and (3) public events.

NGOs produce factual and analytical information on IFI issues. The presentation of this information on websites and its circulation through media channels is an important factor in framing public debates.

Portals such as CHOIKE serve an important function, as do newsletters and listservs. Bretton Woods Project has a newsletter that reaches 60,000 officials, journalists, NGOs, and researchers. Another way of influencing public opinion is through newspaper letters and op-ed pieces, e.g. The Development Gap, Environmental Defense. Related radio interviews of the type given by Gender Action are worth a mention. Equally significant, IFI Watchers Network cultivates ties with the media to help groups gain access to journalists. Notably, International Rivers Network explicitly aims to extend the scope of its publicity beyond mainstream media to industry and alternative sources.

Several NGOs involve local communities in influencing public opinion, thus, Amazon Watch ambitiously trains indigenous groups in the use of media and communications. Training encompasses equipment use, media workshops, email, Internet, and video. It provides public relations support and even brings individuals to US media outlets to advance messages.

Additionally, NGOs use public events to influence opinion. The staging of meetings, rallies, or announcements parallel to IFI meetings is an important phenomenon here. The media regularly uses these actions as evidence of opposition to IFI policies. In relation to this, CEE Bankwatch Network has organized a street exhibition and public poster campaign to raise public awareness.

### ***How remote issues are made relevant to the public***

NGOs may use media campaigns to make far off issues relevant to the public in fully industrialized countries. Document dissemination, involving project-affected persons in media campaigns, and public events are all means of bridging gaps of place and community. Sometimes it is a matter of how an issue is framed, e.g. an allusion by Amazon Watch to Hurricane Katrina. Several other strategies are worth mentioning: (1) art/media-based, (2) direct action-based, and (3) popular education-based efforts.

Several NGOs combine media and art to make remote issues palpable. For example, the Bank Information Center and Friends of the Earth promote films and CEE Bankwatch Network co-produced one. NGOs at times include short video clips on their websites, e.g. Amazon Watch. Links to photo displays is another way of using art to make the impact of policies and projects more immediate. In relation to this, Friends of the Earth Finland and CEE Bankwatch Network co-organized a poster exhibition.

Another way of making events immediate is effective direct action. This encompasses not only the actions discussed in the previous section, but also letter writing campaigns, e.g. Global Response.

Many NGOs use evocative and informative public education strategies. CAFOD publishes the *Rough Guide to Debt*. World Economy, Ecology and Development holds workshops to inform educators and the general public.

### **Government as target**

Most campaigns actually target fully industrialized States. NGOs influence governments by lobbying, testimony, and document submissions. One aim is to influence executive or legislative representatives to readdress the input of national IFI representatives. 50 Years Is Enough gives congressional testimony. Similarly, Christian Aid and Environmental Defense make submissions to the House of Commons. In the US, Friends of the Earth lobbies congress, while Inter Action meets with White House representatives, the National Security Council, and the Treasury Department. Similarly, Halifax Initiative influences the Canadian government in the areas of debt relief, through national monitoring, working with MPs, and through bi-annual civil society consultations with foreign ministers. Campaigns directed at IFI projects target national export credit agencies and insurance arms.

The governments of developing countries are also targeted. For example, advocates involved in the Global Transparency Initiative see the passing of national freedom of information laws as an important goal. At times, NGOs might aim to free up developing country governments from debt burdens. Debt campaigns coordinate multiple nationally directed efforts. Similarly, Action Aid argues that poor countries should have more voice within IFIs.

### **Approaching IFIs**

Campaigns often directly engage IFIs through collaborative or antagonistic tactics. Events at meetings and in front of official offices may be confrontational. Likewise, 'naming and shaming' strategies aim for a significant critical distance. The filing of complaints within IFI dispute resolution mechanisms involves a closer engagement, as does lobbying and working directly for IFIs.

The use of dispute resolution panels has been carefully watched by academics. An important NGO in this area is the Center for

International Environmental Law. NGOs have engaged the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes only through efforts to file amicus briefs. Cases have also been brought outside of these forums, perhaps adopting a more antagonistic stance. For example, Amazon Watch played a role in a class action suit in Ecuador and is also filing a complaint to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

Lobbying is common and takes many forms. Groups may meet with IFIs, e.g. Amazon Watch, Forest Peoples Program, Inter Action, Global Transparency Initiative. They might facilitate discussions between IFI representatives and project-affected people, e.g. Forest Peoples Program. The Structural Adjustment Participatory Review brought together civil society groups and World Bank officials to review structural adjustment programs and to explore options. Organizations may make presentations at IFI meetings, e.g. Center for International Environmental Law. Submissions are another way of seeking influence, e.g. Christian Aid, Jubilee Research. Another type of engagement is to write letters to officials, e.g. Bretton Woods Project, Global Response, New Rules on Governance, NGO Forum on ADB, Probe International.

## **Tools**

Thus far, a number of NGO tools have been discussed, e.g. networking, protests, lobbying, use of media, mounting cases. This subsection presents additional tools: (1) policy and project accountability; (2) public education and information dissemination; (3) research; (4) public mobilization; (5) local capacity building; (6) legal advocacy; (7) call for independent commissions; and (8) event organization. Each of these tools mobilizes 'naming and shaming' strategies and also diplomacy.

Instruments of accountability vary. For example, the Halifax Initiative Coalition produces an annual report card on the Canadian Department of Finance's *Annual Report to Parliament on the Bretton Woods Institutions*. Similarly, Global Transparency Initiative prepared a *Transparency Scorecard* against the criteria set out by the *Transparency Charter* and the Bank Information Center's *IFI Transparency Resource*. Social Watch publishes its annual review which is a multinational-based report assessing whether IFIs have fulfilled commitments. Jubilee Research published the *Jubilee Database* tracking progress towards debt cancellation. The Citizens'

Network on Essential Services' bench-marking project aims to ensure that water laws and regulations protect the public interest. Additionally, the use of field missions to monitor implementation of projects and policies is common.

As discussed above, NGOs aim to educate the general public (and government representatives) about IFI impact. Examples here include CHOIKE, a portal for Southern voices. Freedominfo.org is a network that also serves a portal function. Many NGO websites include alerts, documents, analysis, updates, reports, newsletters, magazines, and listservs. Other examples are multimedia presentations, film, videos, and photos, e.g. Amazon Watch, CEE Bank Watch, Social Justice Committee.

Linked to this is the pursuit and dissemination of independent research. Organizations conduct their own research and also sponsor others.

Information and analysis strategies facilitate public political mobilization. Opportunities to sign petitions (50 Years Is Enough) and letter writing to ministers (Debt and Development, Global Response) are two examples. Following this theme is the use of protest as a tool in the form of days of action, meeting actions and demonstrations outside official offices.

Many NGOs gear themselves towards building local capacity. This may take the form of advocacy assistance, e.g. Center for International Environmental Law, International Accountability Project. Amazon Watch helps affected groups make sense of project documentation. International Rivers Network publishes an action guide, *Dams, Rivers and Rights: An Action Guide for Communities Affected by Dams*. The Pesticide Action Network publishes its *Community Guide to Mobilizing the Bank's Pest Management Policy*. Capacity-building, collaboration, and information assistance are features of many NGO campaigns.

Consequently, as discussed above, NGOs provide legal assistance to affected groups. This support ranges from framing demands in legal parlance (e.g. Bank Information Center, Forest Peoples Program, Indian Law Resource Center), to generic legal advice in the form of guides (International Accountability), to help with panel claims within regional development banks and also within the World Bank's Compliance Advisor Ombudsman and Inspection Panel (e.g. NGO Forum on the ADB), working on amicus briefs for the World Bank

Group's International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, to assistance in bringing class action cases to national courts (e.g. Amazon Watch). Importantly, much of this legal action is possible because NGOs succeeded in establishing legal and policy accountability rules and institutions within IFIs through an earlier generation of campaigns.

Efforts at legal accountability extend to calls for independent commissions to judge IFI actions. For example, Fifty Years Is Enough called for a truth commission to investigate World Bank and IMF actions. Similarly, Social Justice Committee argues for an international tribunal on debt.

Although NGOs use many other tools, a final example is the organization of events. NGOs may hold seminars, conferences or film screenings.

These and other tools may be used in isolation or together as a part of an ongoing movement. In an effort to understand how diverse strategic tools and targeting decisions interact in practice, we turn next to two case studies. Case studies are an important way of evaluating tools.

However, can something more general and evaluative be said about tools? A number of observations might be made. First, it is necessary to define 'success' for the purpose of a specific campaign or aspect thereof. Second, it is important to pay attention to both intended and unintended results of strategies. Third, both national and international lobbying strategies seem to produce notable successes. At the same time, these and other successful strategies do seem to combine a number of tools. An antagonistic strategy coupled with a collaborative one might be effective. It may be that strategies aimed at internal reform create an institutional apparatus that makes subsequent external reform strategies more effective. Likewise, an antagonistic external reform strategy may create pressure that leads to an internal reform. In issues in which multiple actors are involved alongside IFIs, strategies that target a range of actors simultaneously are often effective. This may be because the actors behind policies or projects are themselves extensively networked and attempt to counter NGO gains through coordination. In addition to this, many strategies, such as public education and the contribution to local capacity, may themselves be an end goal.

## Case Studies

This section presents two case studies that address different issue areas, target different but overlapping actors and employ distinct tools. Both are ongoing campaigns that have achieved significant successes but continue to face challenges. The first campaign, an effort by the Global Transparency Initiative to influence the internal disclosure of information policies of several IFIs, concerns internal IFI reform. The other, the Inter-American Development Bank's Camisea natural gas pipeline in Peru is an external campaign. Given space constraints, an effort is made here to point to how tools discussed above are put into practice generically in the context of specific campaigns while also pointing to some of the campaign-specific strategic complexities.

### ***Global Transparency Initiative and IFI information disclosure***

One aim of the Global Transparency Initiative (GTI) is to reform the internal information disclosure policies of IFIs. It is a network comprised of both IFI and freedom of information advocates: Access to Information Network, Article 19, Bank Information Center, Bretton Woods Project, CEE Bankwatch Network, Institute for Democracy in South Africa, and Libertad de Informacion-Mexico AC. It has produced a *Transparency Charter* setting out 9 guiding principles that underpin its actions. Importantly, as with other IFI campaigns, it frames demands in the language of rights. The internal information disclosure campaign is multifaceted, involving: advocacy, the creation of the Charter, the publishing of scorecards, requests for documents through freedom of information laws and case studies. Attention is paid mainly to how these tools relate to efforts to shape IFI disclosure policies.

The GTI pursued a series of coordinated advocacy missions aimed at influencing IFI internal disclosure policies, concerning three groupings: (1) the Asian Development Bank; (2) the World Bank, International-American Development Bank, and International Monetary Fund and (3) the European Investment Bank. Approaches involved face-to-face meetings with officials and document submissions that produced diverse results.

During the period of October 2004 to January 2005, the GTI influenced the Asian Development Bank's review of its disclosure policy. It organized missions in late October 2004 with a follow-up in January

2005. Meetings were scheduled with officers from several parts of the Asian Bank. This mission culminated in a GTI position paper. With this paper, GTI succeeded in significantly influencing the Asian Bank policies in a number of respects. The mission strategy coupled with the paper resulted in the Asian Bank's disclosure policy reflecting recommendations and comments by GTI.

The second mission relates to the early stages of a campaign targeting D.C.-based institutions for internal reform of their disclosure policies. In February of 2005, GTI representatives met a number of officials at the three institutions, presenting key issues. What is significant about these meetings is that they represent the initiation of a dialogue between officials and advocates. The GTI has since issued a *Transparency Scorecard* which is an evaluation of the World Bank Group's disclosure standards. The GTI *Transparency Charter's* 9 principles are the criteria for measuring the World Bank's standards. The scorecard is further informed by the *IFI Transparency Resource*, which was developed by Bank Information Center and freedominfo.org and is a baseline analysis of access to information at the IFIs, comprising almost 250 indicators.

The third mission targeted the European Investment Bank's information policy. In June 2005, an advocacy mission involved lobbying events in Brussels during the course of the European Bank's first ever information policy review. CEE Bank Watch coordinated a statement proposing reforms endorsed by 120 NGOs and then submitted it to the European Bank. Also, a roundtable debate was organized by GTI, CEE Bankwatch Network, and Friends of the Earth-Europe. This event was hosted by a member of the European Parliament and attended by a number of officials. It succeeded in introducing new issues into the debate and the European Bank commented on the proposals. Targeted meetings were then held with Executive Directors. As a direct result of these NGO strategies, the European Bank introduced an unexpected second consultation with a new draft policy. NGOs met with the European Bank in Brussels in November to comment on the draft. Letters and a follow-up meeting have taken place since.

This combination of advocacy missions directed at IFI officials (comment/proposal/submissions), the setting out of guiding legal principles in the form of a Charter and original research represented by the *IFI Transparency Resource* are proving to be fruitful and led to both process reform and also influenced the content of policies.



Moreover, in this internal reform movement (with important external reform implications), we see coordination among NGOs. This campaign relies on diplomacy rather than 'naming and shaming' strategies. It is also directed at IFI officials and national government officials from fully industrialized states. Its impact on external reform campaigns will presumably follow this, it being dependent upon the use that other NGO campaigns make of these internal reforms.

### **Camisea**

The Camisea natural gas pipeline in Peru is financed by the Inter-American Development Bank. It involves extraction in the Nahua-Kugapakori Reserve which is home to a number of indigenous communities including: the Nahua, Kirineri, Nanti, Marhiguenga, and Yine. It is a privatized project, the largest gas project in Latin America. A number of NGOs have been involved in efforts to hold the project accountable to human rights and environmental concerns, including Amazon Watch, Bank Information Center, BankTrack, Environmental Defense, Forest Peoples Program, Friends of the Earth International, Export Credit Agency Watch, Oxfam USA. A dense local layer of civil society actors has also been involved. Protests elicited concessions and policy changes by the Inter-American Bank and other major players, notably the US Export-Import Bank and Equator Principles banks.

To appreciate fully the NGO tactical decisions, it is useful to set out some facts about the project. Camisea was not initiated by the Inter-American Bank; its history dates back to the involvement of Shell and its human rights and environmental practices many years ago. However, Shell and its policy have long since left the scene. To replace Shell, Peru eventually settled on two consortia of international companies for the project, one responsible for the upstream component and the other for the downstream component.

In an important early battle, NGOs successfully opposed a company loan request to the US Import-Export Bank. NGOs pursued 'naming and shaming' strategies, pointing to company connections to the present US administration and to its human rights and environmental track records. The resulting denial of funding was an important NGO success.

The project campaign next turned to the Inter-American Bank where further loans were under consideration. Two large loans were involved. Early NGO intervention resulted in a delay in the decision.

Concern was raised about the Inter-American Bank's internal governance, specifically the absence of a formal public consultation process. Here we see an overlap between internal and external campaigns. NGOs mobilized a high profile letter-writing campaign involving Hollywood celebrities and musicians. Letters were sent to three major stakeholders, the president of the Inter-American Bank, the president of the US national bank and the president of Peru's national bank. Ultimately, it was decided to finance the project. However, importantly, the US member of the Board of Directors abstained from voting. One of the grounds for abstention was 'doubts about the adequacy of the environmental assessment conducted on the project'. This abstention represents another important NGO success. Significantly, however, the US abstained rather than vetoed the loans. The criticism of the decision not to veto was attributed to US legislation, namely the Pelosi Amendment to the International Development Finance Act 1989.

The NGO campaign achieved another significant victory at project conception, as the Inter-American Bank conditioned its loans on the inclusion of human rights and environmental safeguards. In an unprecedented move, failure to comply with these measures was grounds for loan default. It is worth mentioning here that the loans were advanced to the upstream consortium. In another unprecedented move, a cross default provision was inserted whereby failure of the downstream consortium to respect human rights and the environment would result in the default (by the upstream consortium) on the Inter-American Bank loan. Importantly, project contracts were amended so as 'to comply with internationally recognized social and environmental standards.' This contractual response should be seen as a major victory of the early stages of the campaign. At the same time, its ultimate effect and precedent value will be determined by the ongoing strategic back-and-forth between NGOs and project planners.

Another significant aspect of the NGO campaign targeting the Inter-American Bank has been the implementation of the loan conditionalities and the contracts. The Bank has set up a detailed monitoring mechanism. NGOs continue to push for accountability. Community groups and NGOs issued a critical report directed at the Peruvian government. Also, representatives from Amazon Watch, the Institute for Policy Studies, CEADES, OICH, Shina, and Serjall undertook a field mission to see how commitments were being translated into practice. A critical report resulted. NGOs continue to criticize the project in part,

pointing to how public and private bank commitments are not being translated into practice. Actions include letters to the Inter-American Bank president and the CEO of Hunt Oil.

In conclusion, a number of points should be highlighted. First, the NGO campaign employed diverse tactics from 'naming and shaming', to letter writing, to reports, to field missions. Also, the websites of several groups made documents, facts, updates, analysis, and reports part of the public record. Amazon Watch included photos and video clips as well as bilingual material. Second, the campaign had important successes in the form of loan conditionalities and contractual revisions. Third, campaign targets were not limited to the Inter-American Bank, but involved the US government and its Import-Export Bank and also the Peruvian government. Further to this, despite not being discussed, the involvement of Equator Principles Banks is noteworthy. The Equator Principles should be seen as the successful result of NGO campaigns pushing for safeguards on IFI projects that have now been extended to private banks as a result of further NGO action, in part related to the Camisea project. Fourth, NGOs used different types of tactics at each stage of the campaign. In other words, 'naming and shaming' strategies were appropriate for influencing loan decision-making, while field missions were tailored to implementation issues. And lastly, NGOs coordinated strategies and worked with local groups.

### **Conclusion**

To sum up, this report aimed to point to similarities and differences among NGOs in the areas of campaign issues and strategies. It also highlighted coordination among organizations. What emerges is a picture of a dense field of practice, comprised of parallel, overlapping, coordinated, and ongoing campaigns which are facing challenges and achieving noteworthy – albeit sometimes provisional – successes.



## Review of the debates

Advocacy for the reform of international financial institutions (IFIs) is the most diverse and long-standing of the three campaign fields discussed at the seminar. Advocacy in this field involves a wide range of actors, differentiated by their strategic positioning and by their conception of essential themes for IFI reform. Unlike other campaigns, advocacy for the reform of IFIs takes place at a variety of levels: on a global level, but also on a regional level (notably targeting Regional Banks), on a national level (national governments play a major role in advocacy in this field), and even on a local level. The diversity and the heterogeneous nature of these initiatives notwithstanding, studies presented at the seminar and the ensuing debates did highlight a number of aspects common to campaigns focusing on IFI reform.

First and foremost, there is the key issue, raised by several of the participants at the seminar, of the knowledge of targeted institutions. There is clearly a need for a greater understanding of their operations, the tools they use, and of their ongoing development. An enhanced understanding of institutions would facilitate regular review of the relevance and targeting of IFI reform initiatives. Many of today's advocacy campaigns, and this is especially true of campaigns targeting the World Bank, are based on stereotyped and often outdated notions as to the operation and orientation of the institutions concerned. In the field of international finance, many have expressed doubts about strategies that focus solely on IFIs and neglect other important targets, such as private investment banks. IFI reform advocates are confronted to perpetually mutating targets set in a shifting architecture of governance, and for this reason, flexible targeting has become a key aspect of IFI reform campaigns.

Another aspect, which is common to many of the campaigns, is the key issue of producing and distributing information to boost awareness and generate dialogue with the institutions themselves. This raises the question of information and expertise provided by universities and other institutions and bodies, and the nature of the vectors for the distribution of that information to the general public and other advocacy groups.

## **Where should expertise be produced?**

Many of the participants at the seminar are involved in the production and communication of expertise that will provide a resource for advocacy campaigns targeting IFIs, which often depend on research from outside universities. For some of them, their primary focus is first and foremost the production of expertise. This is the case of Eduardo Gudynas' CLAES which conducts research specific to Latin America and the formulation of innovative proposals for the establishment of a new international financial architecture. The International Observatory of Finance, represented by Paul Dembinski, which is also positioned as a resource for advocacy, focuses on analysis and research, and most importantly dialogue with finance specialists.

Other participants spoke of the dual role played by their groups, which both produce and circulate expertise. These organizations often have more direct involvement in the organization of campaigns. CEE Bankwatch represented by Peter Holbil is active on both these fronts. It combines the evaluation of targeted institutions and direct lobbying of members of these institutions with initiatives to raise public awareness on the issues at stake and investment bank practices. Manish Bapna's Bank Information Center also positions itself in this dual perspective of the production of information on banks and the distribution of information as a resource for advocacy. For the Bank Information Center, the information it circulates primarily targets players in its field of advocacy rather than the general public.

### ***Advocacy campaigners' perceptions of universities and think tanks***

To a greater extent than in other campaigns, IFI reform advocacy has a significant political and ideological dimension, and often there are major ideological differences between groups and institutions in the field. For the most part, advocacy campaigners tend to take a negative view of think tanks, which are generally associated with a small number of well-known institutions in the US. Participants at the conference were quick to criticize what they perceive as a lack of critical distance between think tanks and institutions targeted by advocacy, and raised the question of the real independence of think tanks with regard to IFIs. Moreover, several participants bemoaned the relative indifference of think tanks to developments in the world of advocacy and their reluctance to engage in dialogue with NGOs

involved in advocacy campaigns. However, this criticism is largely dependent on a reductive representation of think tanks. In fact the term "think tank" might equally be applied to some of the organizations that produce and distribute advocacy information mentioned above. Today, the challenge is to build more analysis and research organizations with a real capacity to criticize IFI public policies. Not only would they provide advocacy campaigns with a source of information, but they could also provide a useful evaluation of the goals and objectives of advocacy campaigns.

The role of universities in IFI reform advocacy is largely an ambiguous one. In view of the importance of the institutions targeted by campaigns, support from universities can do a great deal to validate and legitimate the hypotheses and proposals of civil society organizations. Many of the participants at the conference had sought to collaborate with innovative university research centers in the field, among them the Latin-American platform ACCION, represented by Miguel Santibanez, which succeeded in establishing close links with the FLACSO: a politically active university network, famous throughout Latin-America. However, examples of this type remain relatively rare. The significant political dimension of campaigns targeting IFIs is a major obstacle to full institutional collaboration with universities and mainly restricts it to individual partnerships with politically committed researchers in specific fields. Individuals have a much greater capacity for mobilization, commitment and innovation than the institutions where they work. However, some notable exceptions were mentioned: the University of Warwick, which has several research centers involved in long-standing partnerships with civil society groups, and the University of Minnesota. The current challenge is to identify and establish links with innovative universities that have the capacity to enter into more committed partnerships with civil society organizations. This kind of collaboration would have the advantage of alerting student groups to the advocacy campaign while engaging the research centers in the same institution.

Finally, Gus Massiah, president of CRID (the Centre for Research and Information on Development) and ex-president of the ATTAC movement added one further element to the debate concerning the role of universities. According to Mr. Massiah, in the long-term the main goal is not so much the provision of expertise but the undermining of widely-accepted precepts so as to force international financial institutions to examine alternative models for economic development. University involvement is necessary for the establishment of

campaigns, but universities are unlikely to foster proposals for real change that break with accepted precepts. It follows that there is a real need for research and analysis organizations outside academia, similar to those mentioned above.

## **New approaches to the distribution of information and relationships with the media**

### ***Raising critical awareness of IFIs in the media***

One of the more innovative approaches concerning the media discussed at the conference was civil society's role as a consultant, and in some cases as a provider of training for non-specialized journalists who have difficulty understanding the technical aspects of issues pertaining to IFIs. Yoko Kitazawa, a member of the Workshop on Global Economic Governance, highlighted the need for this type of initiative when she spoke about her work as an activist targeting Japanese journalists. Communication focused on the issues and the context of campaigns and the explanation of NGO goals. This does much to promote balanced reporting in the media, and should not be confused with information on the progress of the campaigns themselves.

Juliette Majot, who took part in the 50 Years Is Enough campaign for the 50th anniversary of the World Bank, also spoke of the need to foster "a balanced approach in the media." When the World Bank's communications departments attempted to make use of the occasion of its 50th anniversary to promote the bank in the media, civil society groups mobilized to distribute contradictory information to encourage greater skepticism among journalists, and to prevent them from simply "regurgitating" the bank's press releases.

### ***The creation of new vectors for the distribution of information***

Difficulty in gaining access to the media has prompted some groups to create their own communications tools so as to establish direct contact with a specific audience and increase the direct impact on the institutions they target. For example, the Bretton Woods Project distributes regular reports and updates on the activities of International Financial Institutions, with the dual goal of promoting a better understanding of the reality of Bretton Woods institutions and exerting an influence on the internal policies within them.



### ***The strategic use of leaked information***

The use made of leaks provided a further illustration of the fundamental importance of information transmission in this campaign. The leaking of information functions as a highly effective safeguard for public accountability. The recent experience of Louis Clark of the Government Accountability Project highlighted the need for a strategic approach in the management of leaks. In the course of recent events implicating the president of the World Bank, Mr. Wolfowitz, the Government Accountability Project made sure that leaks focused criticism on the Bank's president without undermining other members of the board of that institution. This information management policy was part of a strategy to obtain reforms in the short term and at the same time to preserve long-term alliances with other staff within the bank.

### ***The right level of media exposure***

Finally, there was one further point which is often a feature of IFI campaigns: the reservations some of the players have regarding disclosure of information to the media. Louis Clark of the Government Accountability Project raised this issue with regard to his experience of the campaign focusing on the International Criminal Court. When the goal is to implement change in institutions and governments, the publication of sensitive information can be counterproductive and damaging to advocacy campaigns.

### **Collaboration or opposition: the ongoing conflict in advocacy strategies**

The wide range of strategic positions adopted by civil society groups involved in IFI advocacy is a reflection of the variety of levels of reform targeted by campaigns. Campaign objectives vary: some campaigns simply aim to exert influence on specific projects of a given institution, others target internal institutional reform, and more radical campaigns question the very existence of institutions and their role in global governance. The type of campaign largely determines the advocacy strategy, notably with regard to the choice between internal collaboration and external mobilization. In the field of IFI reform, Bankwatch is an example of an organization that makes use of an approach based on collaboration with regional institutions. At the other end of the spectrum, the strategy adopted by ATTAC,

represented at the conference by Gus Massiah, is largely dependent on mobilization to exert external pressure on targeted institutions.

The coordination of internal and external approaches is often hindered by mutual mistrust and a lack of dialogue between the proponents of these two types of strategy. Roberto Bissio of TWI-Social Watch spoke of the difficulty of conducting a common campaign. In the instance he described, civil society organizations had been invited to play a potential, though somewhat peripheral, role at an IFI meeting. The division between organizations advocating a boycott of the meeting and those in favor of collaboration was harmful to both the internal and external strategies. The insiders were accused of self-censorship and failure to maintain a critical distance from the targeted institutions. The outsiders were accused of discrediting the cause they purported to support through the excessive mobilization of external public opinion and the radicalization of the positions adopted by civil society. In the past, conflict between internal and external strategies for IFI reform was mainly confined to Washington, however, with the development of regional centers of the IFIs, this issue has become a problem for civil societies in New Delhi and Addis-Ababa and other IFI centers. The challenge now is to establish a dialogue between the advocates of internal and external strategies so that civil societies with common goals reinforce rather than undermine each other.

Several of the participants at the conference spoke of the need to establish a dialogue on the goals and values of insiders and outsiders before the start of a campaign. This type of dialogue can help avoid a common stumbling block in IFI campaigns: a conflict over legitimacy, with insiders claiming to represent outsiders' positions, and outsiders insisting that their proposals be placed on the agenda at meetings, even when there has been no prior debate or consultation on those proposals. The NGO Forum on ADB succeeded in overcoming this problem by organizing extensive negotiations between civil societies in the run up to the 2006 meeting of the Asian Development Bank in India. After eight months of consultation, the associations reached agreement on an approach to the event, which coordinated the actions of NGOs invited to meetings and external protests outside the summit.

In some cases, cohesion between internal and external strategies is made less problematic by the existence of a civil society group that is active both as an insider and an outsider. Juliette Major's experience

in the 50 Years is Enough campaign (mentioned above), where the same groups were involved in internal negotiations and in the mobilization of external protests, provided an apt illustration of the important role played by intermediary groups in the success of a campaign.

In the experience of several of the participants at the conference, divergence on the issue of internal and external strategies was not the main cause of conflict between civil societies targeting IFIs. They took the view that in most cases conflict was caused by an inability to formulate clear shared objectives. A well-defined and widely supported objective is a prerequisite for a successful advocacy campaign, and with this in mind, some of the speakers at the conference questioned the usefulness of theoretical discussions on campaign strategy that failed to focus on the goals of the campaigns themselves.

## **Network building**

### ***The independence of member organizations and network interfaces***

The question of the type of criteria that should provide the basis for civil society organization's networking was frequently posed in the debate on IFI campaigns. The independence of civil society organizations and their critical distance from the institutions they target are key issues in this field of advocacy, and several participants warned against the danger of members of civil society networks being co-opted by institutions they were attempting to reform. They also emphasized the need for a clearly defined policy on the control of players involved at the negotiation interface.

### ***A balance between formal and informal networks***

The debate on this campaign also focused on the need for a balance between networks that have been formally organized on a geographical or theme-oriented basis, and less formal networks that enable civil society organizations to be active on several fronts. Peter Hlobil of CEE Bankwatch spoke of the need for organizations to be involved in a range of parallel networks, so as to avoid doing the "the same as the others," to improve the circulation of information, and ensure a more rapid collective response to events. According to P. Hlobil, networks have provided CEE Bankwatch with an opportunity to convince other civil society actors to commit to causes it supports.

It follows that the logic of advocacy is not only "vertical" or institution-oriented, but also "horizontally" oriented to convince other civil society groups to rally to the causes defended by one's own organization. This remark brings us to a more general point raised by many of the participants at the conference: the difficulty experienced by civil society groups when it's time to develop their advocacy campaign outside of its usual field of action. What can be done to encourage groups involved in parallel initiatives to think outside the box, so as to establish connections between what are often intrinsically linked dimensions of the same campaign?

## **II. The International Taxation Campaign**



# **Introduction to Innovative Sources of Financing for Development**

*by Coordination Sud*

## **Inter-governmental progress on innovative sources**

### ***Putting international taxation on the agenda***

A new cycle of international negotiations on development finance was initiated in 2000 with the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by the UN general assembly. Two years later, during the Monterrey summit on financing for development, the international community committed to improving the financing of the MDGs, including increasing the amount of public aid towards development. Development NGOs from both the Northern and Southern hemisphere mobilized in their preparation in support of the progress made at Monterrey and also their support of the MDGs (Global Call Against Poverty etc.).

In January of 2004, French president Jacques Chirac, Brazilian president Luis Ignacio Da Silva and Chilean president Ricardo Lagos made a statement in Geneva, advocating the creation of a project team in order to identify new sources for development finance which would complement the engagements outlined at Monterrey. In this statement, supported by Kofi Annan, the heads of state affirmed that the MDGs cannot be reached with the current level of development aid. Moreover, MDGs and public goods necessitate regular and stable funds – unlike traditional public aid which is characterized by its volatility, ergo its unsuitability to regular and repeated social expenditure. Accordingly, it was agreed that methods to tap additional, regular funding were needed - most notably from international taxes. The three founding nations of this group initiative against hunger and poverty became, with Spain, the 'quadripartite group' and now, with the addition of Germany, Algeria and South Africa the G7+ Norway as observing nation.

The launch of this inter-governmental group was preceded by the setting up by Jacques Chirac of a group of international experts: the Landau group. Their primary inquiry centered on the question of 'New International Fiscal Contributions'. The NGOs were represented by Coordination SUD, the umbrella body for French development NGOs

and by ATTAC France. In September 2004, the Landau group and the quadripartite group published two reports exploring different possible methods. These reports, commissioned by the respective governments, affirmed the necessity of establishing international taxes, highlighting the advantages of this kind of financing (stable and regular) as well as its feasibility and legitimacy. In an age of intense economic globalization it is both legitimate and necessary to establish systems of international taxation, deducted from trans-national economic flows with as their aim the financing of international solidarity initiatives and global public goods.

### ***The diplomatic promotion of innovative sources and the participation of NGOs***

The objective of the quadripartite group is to recruit as many members of the international community as possible towards the implementation of these innovative sources. This diplomatic strategy is marked by the international declaration of support for this initiative, at the UN general assembly of September 2004, signed by 111 states. A second 'Declaration on Innovative Sources of Financing Development' propounding the launch of a pilot tax, on airline tickets, was adopted by 79 states during the 60th general assembly of the UN (September 2005). On this occasion France and Chile announced that they would impose a tax on airline tickets in 2006.

In February 2006, France organized the first international conference on innovative sources, involving predominantly NGOs. Fifteen states agreed to introduce a 'solidarity taxation on airline tickets'. At this conference, UNITAID was presented as an innovative redistribution of resources. A monetary fund with medium-term stability, it is maintained by regular and stable resources, allowing it to purchase the necessary medical products against the three major pandemics affecting the nations of the Southern hemisphere. The objective is simultaneously to assure the provision of these products and services and to lower the cost of treatment. A 'Pilot Group on Solidarity Taxation' comprising 40 states was established to discuss and promote the implementation of the pilot program and to sustain the debate on alternative innovative sources such as 'Solidarity Taxation' (international taxes etc.) Following this conference, Coordination SUD (in collaboration with ABONG, the umbrella body for Brazilian NGOs) and Accion (ditto for Chile) organized campaigns and initiatives based on the issues raised during these talks, aiming at the mobilization of civil



society actors in order to create an international coalition in support of this initiative. In the hope of achieving a common and shared position on this issue, a declaration made by the NGOs on innovative sources was posited. This declaration was signed by 80 organizations from civil society, of which many signatories are national platforms from every continent, or international networks, representing thousands of NGOs. A strategic meeting of NGOs was organized by Coordination SUD and ATTAC France on the eve of this event, as well as by various international platforms. For the first time, actors engaged in diverse programs were united to officially agree to the declaration and to the joint strategy for international taxes, these included: umbrella bodies for the Southern and Northern hemisphere NGOs, development NGOs, NGOs working on health and against the spread of AIDS, movements for the Tobin tax and the campaign against tax evasion. A triennial plan of action was adopted by these movements to support State action regarding the implementation of programs of international fiscal contribution towards development funding. Various levels of mobilization are envisaged: by country, by continent and on an international scale. A statement regarding this plan of action is expected in 2008, to coincide with the G8 summit in Japan. Another objective of the NGO meeting was to discuss the possible participation of the NGO representatives in the official conference.

Brazil will be holding the first presidency of the 'Pilot Group for Solidarity Contributions' for a period of six months; Norway will undertake this in the following six months. A plenary session will be organized during each presidency, following the format of the conference in Paris. As in Paris, the national platform for the host country (ABONG for Brazil, Forum for Norway) will coordinate the intervention of the NGOs at the official conference, organizing an NGO meeting on the eve of the conference. This series of NGO meetings will permit movements from different continents, working on different issues, to consolidate this informal coalition. Specialized networks on international tax, or on the campaign against tax evasion (Stamp Out Poverty, WEED, Tax Justice Network) will attend the meetings of the pilot governmental group, adding to the informal coalition with the founding umbrella bodies, and supporting the national platform of the pilot host country. Contact has been established with the national platform of South Korea, in view of the next plenary session which will take place in Seoul in September 2007.

The NGOs also take full advantage of the forum for free expression provided by the official conferences on innovative sources. The host

country platform presents the general analysis by the coalition of NGOs involved in these meetings, while specialized networks intervene on more specific points (CTT, campaign against tax evasion, UNITAID etc.) On their proposal, the Norwegian presidency has suggested the creation of two international task forces: one concentrating on a tax on currency transactions (Currency Transaction Tax or CTT) and the other on the campaign against tax evasion. For want of a volunteer state to coordinate the project, these two task forces have not yet been created.

The next presidency will be held by South Korea. Aside from the implementation of the pilot program and the advancement of the debate on other taxes, the challenge is to translate this group of countries into a North-South pressure group, the goal being to place the question of international taxes firmly on the agenda at the next international conference on financing for development in Doha at the end of 2008.

### ***The reasons mobilizing the NGOs on this method***

NGOs and citizen movements have succeeded in introducing the issue of international taxation into both European and international debate, pressured by a public awareness alerted by movements such as ATTAC bringing it to the fore. This is a two-pronged approach effecting both a regulation of financial globalization and the supply of international funds with which to finance development. It is via the question of potential 'innovative sources' of development finance that this issue has emerged on the diplomatic scene, under the impulse of some heads of state. From the outset, the NGOs have been associated with this initiative and operated in full cooperation with the Landau group. Given their expertise in this area and their role in the emergence of this issue in the public arena, the NGOs denote a neutral or objective alliance. The NGOs are vectors of decisive influence towards diplomatic action in this domain. Primarily, it will require an ideological battle to win over public opinion, the media and other opinion makers, and, ultimately, the governments of other countries. Unlike in other campaigns, the NGOs mobilized are here part of a strategy of neutral alliance with the promoting governments in an effort to incite other governments to follow suit. However, in their statement on international taxation, the NGOs stipulated that their support is dependant on a series of criteria, which have not been met in the official outlines of the program. They are, therefore, appealing to the Pilot Group and

exerting pressure on the scheme in order to re-orientate it as follows. First, they have demanded that a certain number of conditions regarding the implementation of the pilot scheme be respected, so as to ensure that the scheme will constitute a true enhancement of development finance, and will form part of an international taxation system. This must also be a real international tax and not simply a voluntary contribution, the amount being additional to the APE. This should be coupled with the tax on airline tickets and on the system of subsidies (UNITAID) in order to demonstrate, in a concrete way, the benefits of international taxation above other forms of financial contribution.

Primarily, international taxes offer considerable benefits to development finance, permitting not only the sourcing of new funds but also improving the very nature of the flow of funds to development. Hitherto, the unpredictability of the APE has undermined the efforts of the recipient countries in their endeavors to implement strategies of sustainable development. The imposition of wholly concessionary, stable and regular monetary contributions is thus essential for the achievement of the MDGs. This first dimension goes some way towards explaining the mobilization of development NGOs, who are necessarily implicated in the question of development finance.

However, there is also the need for a change of model with regards to traditional development aid. The support of NGOs in launching these pilot mechanisms is part of a more general analysis of the implementation of a real international taxation system. They do not envisage these schemes as simply 'innovative sources' or devices for development finance, but more as the germ of a global structure for wealth redistribution. Economic and financial globalization has intensified inequalities and destabilized the poorest communities. Yet numerous trans-national financial exchanges avoid national taxation. Therefore this economic and financial globalization must be accompanied by the implementation of schemes to ensure fiscal regulation and redistribution, displaying a policy of international solidarity in the financial domain. Taxes on the profits of the principal beneficiaries of globalization (multi-national corporations, the financial industries) and taxes on activities considered harmful to communal interests (environmental taxes) would then appear to be, from this perspective, fair measures towards the regulation of globalization. In creating this precedent, the proposed scheme would serve as a fundamental step towards the legitimization and the subsequent launch of increasingly ambitious far reaching taxation schemes. The NGOs involved in this

process are also appealing for the launch of other, more ambitious international taxes, the most pressing of which is the Currency Transaction Tax (CTT), as well as the campaign to eliminate tax evasion and tax havens. For many of the organizations in favor of these proposals the 'Solidarity Tax' on airline tickets will not only have dramatic effects in terms of actual funds raised, but will represent a step in the right direction towards more ambitious projects in the international arena.

The challenge is, therefore, to maintain the balance between these two dimensions: practical support for the implementation of a first scheme of more modest dimensions – effectively creating a precedent – along with the sustained appeal for ambitious international taxes and fiscal regulation on an international scale. This is all the more important since the movements involved in this scheme are working towards different goals and with different strategies, which often diverge.

## **Principal actors involved**

### ***The coalition of national NGO platforms from the founding nations***

The question of international taxes has emerged in the public domain through the mobilization of citizen movements campaigning for the Tobin tax, the best known of which is the ATTAC movement. Yet the mobilization of civil society following the inter-governmental initiative on innovative sources was initiated by the national platforms for Brazilian, Chilean and French NGOs following the creation of the quadripartite group. In August 2004, Coordination SUD, Accion and ABONG met in Brasilia in this context, at a meeting of the quadripartite group. ATTAC France was also invited. The main objective was to ensure the coordination of the dialogue of the three national platforms with their respective governments and the mobilization of national public opinion, while simultaneously maintaining the link with other actors in civil society, for example the citizen movements focalized on international taxation. The other objective was to mobilize the NGOs of other nations in order to expand the initiative. An initial dialogue between government representatives was organized at this meeting. The three national platforms also arrived at a common position to adopt the first international 'Declaration on Innovative Sources' (September 2004). (This had initially been laid before the heads of state gathered at a UN general assembly by the director of

ABONG.) This interaction between the national platforms and their governments continues today, just as the permanent dialogue between the three national platforms is still active. Across the three governments there is a partially critical interaction, since if these national platforms support the inter-governmental initiative then they will also bring their own demands. The national platforms meet government representatives regularly concerning this matter. They are also involved in the official meetings, acting as a mouthpiece for the NGOs in this scheme (Coordination SUD at the Paris conference, ABONG at the plenary session of the 'Pilot Group' in Brasilia and Accion during the G-7 talks in Santiago, Chile). Moreover, Coordination SUD has served as an interface between the permanent secretary of the 'Pilot Group' (in the person of the French foreign minister) and the NGOs.

These national platforms are themselves members of regional NGO coalitions, within which they transmit their views on innovative sources. In Europe, Coordination SUD and CNCD (the Belgian francophone national platform) mobilized in 2005 during the EU talks on the adoption of a European tax on airline tickets. They launched an appeal signed by various European NGOs, thus putting this issue on the agenda of CONCORD, the European confederation of NGOs. The challenge consisted in mobilizing the national platforms or development NGO networks within CONCORD, who were often not particularly politicized, and had strong reservations regarding what could be considered as forming part of the 'anti-globalization' movement. Nevertheless, Coordination SUD (in collaboration with ATTAC France) came to an agreement with the European Network on Currency Transaction Tax (ENCTT) – which brings together the principal European organizations campaigning for the Tobin Tax – to place this issue firmly on their agenda. For their part, Accion and ABONG advanced this question within their national platform coalition and in the Latin American NGO network, La Mesa de Articulacion, thus ensuring that the promotion of innovative sources figured in both the register and the charter of this regional coalition. Basically, these platforms work bilaterally with other partner platforms, working on this question within their own national context - for example the Spanish platform or the Indian platform. Accordingly, they have established a link with the Norwegian platform so that it might coordinate the NGO meeting in Oslo, when the time comes.

### ***The constitution of an international coalition and assembly with other interested parties***

From the outset, two major groups of actors were associated with this process, the national platforms for development NGOs and the movements led by citizen mobilization on international taxes. The national platforms decided, somewhat organically, to pursue this issue in conjunction with other implicated civil society actors, notably ATTAC, who, like Coordination SUD, was already present within the Landau group. All the NGO talks during the official conferences on innovative sources were, therefore, co-organized by ATTAC, as were the numerous seminars on international taxes during various global social Forums. Coordination SUD have even integrated themselves into the European network of movements working towards the tax on currency transaction (ENCTT) to ensure tighter links. Generally, the national platforms have endeavored to involve the principal civil society actors working on themes related to this process. These diverse groups of actors were united on common objectives, signing an 'NGO Declaration on International Taxes' and adopting a triennial, collective plan of action. However, within this group many individual actors pursue contrasting strategic or political goals, while hoping to exploit their specific strengths and specializations.

Outside the national platforms, the other actors involved are the following:

#### *Campaigns in favor of Currency Transaction Taxes*

Since the mid-nineties, many Western European movements are leading active campaigns for the introduction of a tax on currency transactions. The best-known among these is ATTAC, which was established to promote the Tobin tax. Among these movements many have adopted a strategic approach that involves targeting the by-products of financial globalization and establishing systems of regulation and redistribution on an international scale. The emblematic measure promulgated by these movements is the Tobin tax, and its variant, the Spahn tax which aims to protect against capital risks, while constituting a global tax and consequently raising funds towards international solidarity or the financing of global public goods. The principal European movements are united within the structure of the European Network on CCT (ENCTT). Included are ATTAC, Stamp Out Poverty (ex UK Tobin tax network, a British campaign uniting approximately 50 NGOs and other actors

from the civil society), 11.11.11 (the platform for Flemish-Belgian NGOs), WEED (Germany), CPRBM, (Italy) Oïkos (Netherlands). These organizations participate directly in the informal coalition of NGOs supporting the Pilot Group, as well as meeting regularly to coordinate their strategies at a European level. Coordination SUD has joined this coalition to establish an interface between the dynamics of the national platforms and that of the administration of the Pilot Group. Other organizations from non-European countries belonging to the OCDE such as the North-South Institute (Canada) or Altermonde (Japan) are committed to this question. Certain development NGOs are equally active on this subject, such as CIDSE, the network of catholic development NGOs for Europe and North America.

All of these movements are committed, to a greater or lesser extent, to the support of this inter-governmental process on innovative sources and many have taken an active part in the mobilization of the NGOs (Stamp Out Poverty, WEED). There are, however, certain ideological or strategic differences regarding their relative positions on the official process. Certain movements have in their sight the introduction of ambitious, long-term international taxes within their field of vision, but pragmatically support the implementation of an initial pilot project, i.e. the tax on airline tickets. Stamp Out Poverty, for example, leads campaigns supporting such a tax in the United Kingdom. In addition to this, they are proposing the adoption of a 'Solidarity Contribution on International Financial transactions' (CTDL) or even, in the case of Great Britain, 'Stamp Duty' as a secondary pilot scheme that could be launched unilaterally by a member state of the Group or within a monetary zone, for example within the Euro zone. This would not be a tax which would have a regulating effect on financial flows but deduct a negligible sum (0.005%) on financial transactions (to avoid distorting the amount) – whose unique goal would be to raise supplementary resources with which to fund the MDGs. Other movements such as 11.11.11 or ATTAC France have maintained their original positions in support of a Tobin or Spahn tax as a tool for the eventual regulation of globalization. They see the tax on airline tickets as an opportunity to bring this question to the international arena, but remain quite reserved regarding the official nature of the initiative and do not support the CTDL either, which they see as having a potentially detrimental effect on the concept of a currency transaction tax.

### *The network against tax evasion: Tax Justice Network*

Tax Justice Network is a vast international coalition of civil society organizations campaigning against tax evasion, capital 'leaks' and tax havens. This network promotes above all the abolition of tax havens and the disclosure of offshore banking. Tax Justice Network has been involved since the meeting in Paris; this line of thinking on international taxation was already present within the Landau group and the quadripartite group, in the form of a proposal of an international tax on financial transactions within tax havens. This issue has since been taken on board by the majority of the NGOs and national platforms working on development finance or the movements working on the CTT. Tax Justice Network is mounting an appeal to that effect for the GT-7 as well as for the Pilot Group. The campaign against tax evasion, along with the CTDL, has been identified as one of the two major themes being treated by the NGOs within the Pilot Group.

### *The networks and North-South development NGOs involved in development finance (MDGs, monitoring post-Monterrey)*

This additional category of actors is involved to a lesser degree in this process. At the time of the launch of the inter-governmental initiative many of these NGOs had been committed to the global campaign for the MDGs (Global Call against Poverty). The majority of these, however, take a prudent stance regarding the political nature of taxes such as the Tobin tax. The main goal for them is a scheme that will raise additional and better-adapted funds to the classic APD in order to achieve the MDGs. The question of innovative sources will probably come up again, in view of the summit at the end of 2008 in Doha on development finance (Monterrey +6). However, many of these movements remain cautious regarding the supplementary nature of these schemes. These schemes should not be a substitute for the rich nations' engagement to donate 0.07% of their national wealth to public aid for development, but should instead constitute complementary financial flow with which to attain the MDGs.

### *NGOs campaigning for health; NGOs campaigning against AIDS*

These NGOs entered into the process during the conference in Paris, when it was decided to direct the funds generated from the tax on airline tickets to the purchase of treatment against the three



major pandemics affecting the Southern hemisphere. Therefore, they are primarily interested in UNITAID, which facilitates the raising of supplementary funds and which is an innovative scheme for the reallocation of resources. They center their lobbying on this scheme, seeking to secure the supplementary and regular nature of these resources, their efficient management and, ultimately, a fall in the price of medicines. Regarding this last point, they have established a strong link between their ADPIC appeal and the problem of access to generic medicines. The international tax remains secondary for these organizations, even if they recognize the stability and regularity value of this type of finance. The French NGOs campaigning against AIDs (Act up, AIDES, Sidaction) have been engaged in very strong lobbying of the French government. They work in collaboration with their international networks within civil society and the Global Funds to fight AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. Organizations working with the communities of the sick in the Southern hemisphere participate in the Pilot Group plenary sessions and they also hold a seat within UNITAID. The other seat is occupied by Act up (standing in for Oxfam, UK) to represent the Northern NGOs. These two seats, reserved for civil society representatives, are the practical result of the lobbying of the AIDS NGOs.

### *Environmental NGOs*

The environmental NGOs are poorly represented, despite the inclusion of environmental taxes into the 'NGO Declaration'. Their standpoints (which can often be conflicting with those of development NGOs) did, however, find a certain resonance with some representatives of the Norwegian government during the plenary session at Oslo. Certain environmental organizations advanced the idea of transforming the airline ticket tax into a carbon tax, aiming simultaneously to reduce air traffic and finance the campaign against climate change. It is highly likely that the question of environmental taxes aimed at fighting climate change (taxes on CO<sub>2</sub>, on air or sea transport) will take on a greater importance in the coming years and that the environmental NGOs, who already defend these types of schemes within environmentally orientated international bodies, will become more involved in the inter-governmental process. During the Oslo talks, the NGO coalition identified an alliance with the environmental NGOs on international taxes as an important strategic goal.

## The tools

### *The action of the National Platforms*

The national NGO platforms are not specialized in the launch of campaigns. Their primary activity is the lobbying of their governments and of influential figures, as well as the mobilization of their members and other members of civil society regarding this process. They regularly meet with their governments and with the secretary of the Pilot Group to transmit information regarding the positions of the NGOs, so that this information may be disseminated accordingly. The question of international taxes is a fundamental part of their lobbying of members of parliament and political parties, particularly during electoral campaigns and in the national campaigns in which they are active (MDGs, etc.)

Since their initial mobilization, the three national platforms have endeavored to extend their alliances with other actors from diverse sectors of civil society (from different continents) liable to support this process, thus creating a large-scale movement. The elaboration of an initial document addressed to their heads of state, outlining their common position, was subsequently circulated on both a European and international level, and constituted a common basis on which to rally numerous different actors. This document, signed by trans-continental organizations of different natures, served as the foundation for lobbying activities in these countries. The organization of NGO talks and the invitation to the plenary sessions of the Pilot Group extended to the NGOs progressively consolidated this large NGO coalition. In addition to this, thanks to a large mailing list, Coordination SUD is able to update the various actors involved on the progress of the Pilot Group. However, these types of tools are limited. It is difficult to ensure that the coordination of this coalition is both very informal and homogeneous across two separate NGO meetings. During the Oslo meeting, certain networks offered to provide a supervisory coordination of the meeting to follow this process.

With a view to raising awareness among their members as well as among the various public and non-governmental actors, the national platforms have organized seminars on innovative sources: the national platform for Spain at the Spanish parliament, Accion (in Santiago), VANI – WEED (in India), CNCD (Brussels). Alternatively they intervene in other set-ups within civil society (the Brazilian social forum, the Altermonde seminar in Tokyo etc.) Essentially, in collaboration

with other organizations, the three national platforms organize seminars on international taxes at global social forums, where they are able to discuss the progress of the scheme.

### **The campaigns**

The movements working on the CTT are very active and pursue simultaneously research, campaigning and appeal/lobbying. WEED (Germany), Stamp Out Poverty (United Kingdom) Campagna per la riforma della Banca Mondiale (Italy), Oïkos (Netherlands), NIGD (Finland), various sections of ATTAC, the North-South Institute and others have published many reports on the operational introduction of the CTT or on the imposition of a CTDL on various currencies (the Pound Sterling, the Norwegian Crown, the Euro, a project including the Yen etc.) These organizations coordinate regular seminars regarding this issue. They were able to develop this expertise by working with actors from the financial markets and from universities. Since then, their recommendations have gained credibility and have been included on the agenda at the Paris conference and also at an international workshop organized by the Norwegian government. During the plenary session of the Pilot Group in Oslo, these suggestions were once again debated, and resulted in the proposal by the Norwegian government, to create an international task force dedicated to this subject. Many of these organizations also participated in their capacity as experts in the plenary sessions of the Pilot Group. These organizations are preparing for a follow-up to the Monterrey process, in anticipation of the 2008 conference in Doha.

Besides this evaluation activity, these networks organize various lobbying and campaign activities in their countries, which have brought about tangible results (the passing of laws on the CTT in Canada, France and in Belgium, with talks at the Austrian and Italian parliaments) – including more general results in Europe (a debate on the Tobin tax at the European parliament). Similarly to what 11.11.11, ATTAC Flanders in Belgium, or ATTAC in France were able to achieve, CRBM are currently conducting intensive parliamentary lobbying to coincide with the examination of legislative proposals regarding the CCT. Members of the ENCTT are also working in collaboration with them to keep the question of international taxes firmly on the agenda at the European Parliament. Currently, their members are working with some MEPs to resuscitate the project team of the European parliament concerning the CTT question.

These networks also organize regular seminars in their own countries to promote the notion of international taxes via the media, leaders of associations, academics and politicians. Certain movements organizing events within their own countries (recently: Oikos in the Netherlands, CRBM in Italy, Altermonde in Japan) mobilize the expertise and methods developed in other nations (Stamp out Poverty, WEED) – or draw on human resources, such as the academics associated with certain organizations. Moreover, these organizations disseminate their ideas through the organization of seminars or workshops during civil society summits (the counter-summit of the G8, Alternative Ecofin, Global Social Forum, European Social Forum etc.) Essentially they produce documents and publications for public education, working with the media and setting up initiatives in close collaboration with parliaments, governments and international organizations.

The majority of these organizations benefit from the support of a network of activists available to relay their proposals, or to bring pressure to bear on governments through campaigning. For example, Stamp Out Poverty regularly mobilizes its activist network on letter writing campaigns or electronic petitions to the British authorities in support of the adoption of the CTT on the Pound Sterling ('Stamp Duty on Pounds') or for the tax on airline tickets in the United Kingdom. Similarly, ATTAC Germany organizes stunts (symbolic actions the specific aim of which is to attract media attention) to demonstrate their support for the CTT or the airline ticket tax.

## Review of the debates

If the specific outlines of the international taxation campaign represent relatively new challenges today, in fact they harp back to much older struggles regarding the role of taxation and how it should be used at a national level. However, this campaign can already boast several very positive results, linked precisely to the highly innovative dimension of its actions. It has highlighted the extent of the informal economy at the international level (specifically tax havens and methods of tax evasion) and the necessity for the regulation of international transactions, specifically financial ones. More importantly, it has introduced a new model for financing the development of global public goods.

Another specificity of this campaign much in evidence in the case study proposed by Coordination Sud is the existence of a close collaboration between civil society actors and governments (specifically France, Brazil and Chile). This collaboration does not disregard the important differences in perspectives on and conceptions of the role of international taxation; but it does determine the advocacy strategies set up at a national level.

Through the specifics of this campaign, it is possible to identify some responses to the issues that were brought up throughout the seminar.

### **Advocacy strategies: working with governments without losing sight of long term perspectives**

Several elements, drawn from the campaign conducted in France, bear out close collaboration between civil society and government. To begin with, the French President himself invited Coordination Sud and ATTAC to join a reflection group on the topic ("Landau Group"). Collaboration occurred even before the advocacy process itself. This led to a diplomatic strategy in which the nations involved attempted, specifically within the United Nations to enroll other countries' support. Civil society usefully backed and modulated the actions of the governments involved. In parallel,

NGOs occupied the public arenas created around official conferences. Within this context, several questions can be asked:

### ***How to reconcile the collaboration process within institutions and maintain a form of outside pressure by civil society actors?***

The maintenance of a double inside/outside dynamics was sustained throughout the campaign specifically by the alliance of actors specialized in government lobbying (the national federations of NGOs) alongside actors mobilized on broad advocacy actions as is the case with WEED in Germany, Stamp Out Poverty in the United Kingdom or ATTAC in France.

Furthermore, to imagine a “healthy” collaboration with government, several actors mobilized in this campaign, specifically Peter Wahl of WEED, stressed the necessity of identifying in a pragmatic way the concrete “advantages” for government to appropriate part of the campaign’s objects. In the present case, the setting up of new ways of financing development appears as a way, for a country like France, to show the international community its strong engagement towards the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals. It having no part in the rise of national public aid to 0,7% of GNP, this additional measure illustrates a concrete engagement of France in the field of international cooperation..

### ***Whom to work with within government?***

In many participants’ experience, not least that of Paul Dembinsky of the Observatoire International de la Finance, it is better to collaborate with people rather than institutions. Institutional bureaucracy and the forces of inertia that characterize most institutions are often obstacles to NGOs’ being able to set up formal collaborations with institutions. The “international taxation” campaign is characterized on the French side by the direct involvement of the French President in the setting up of a working group and distribution of roles. This close and direct collaboration presents a risk of instability. The French President has changed and so the mobilized NGOs must organize a new campaign of awareness towards new potential candidates. The key question of how to conceive of a long-term approach when institutional interlocutors change remains unresolved

### ***How to ensure the articulation between success in the short term and the prospect of a more long term campaign?***

Many actors involved seek two long-term objectives. On the one hand, a new source of stable and lasting development financing must emerge, and international financial transactions must also be better regulated. In this framework, the choice of a "pilot" tax, striking not at the financial flows proper but at a very specific product (airline tickets) is envisaged only as a first step and is still an isolated achievement. The actors are divided on the capacity of this first step to open up a real debate on long-term development. How to ensure that this first successful collaboration between government and civil society won't prevent civil society actors from keeping open the broader issue of international taxation on the agenda? For the social movements involved, especially ATTAC, represented at the seminar by Gus Massiah, the punctual demands are only meaningful when they keep up with the theoretical discussion that underpins them. According to him, the larger goal organized civil society actors must stay focused on is the substitution of the "charity" approach for a "right to development" approach along with the means to set up global public regulation.

### **NGO coalitions at the heart of the advocacy process**

Creating networks, platforms and alliances within civil society organizations are particularly significant in this campaign, specifically because of the very active role played by national NGO federations in the advocacy process.

### ***What is the "added value" of the action of national platforms in the campaigns?***

The NGO platforms constitute a civic voice within the campaign to help raise awareness of other civil society actors who advocate new methods of development financing and public goods on a global scale. This awareness is envisaged on two levels:

- in a national framework first: reinforce the mobilization of actors unaware of the campaign issues,
- in an international framework next, in order to raise civil society awareness in those countries not very involved in the field. When, for countries like France or Brazil, the issue consists in trying to bring new countries into an alliance on their positions, civil society coalitions

tions can often pave the way for diplomacy by building up the receptivity to the campaign among civil society organizations.

An example of a tool used to raise awareness among civil society actors at a national and international level is the systematic organization of NGO meetings in parallel with the official conferences organized by the States, in the host countries (France, Brazil, Norway, etc;)

NGO platforms also allow for unification of the voices of civil society around a few leaders capable of negotiating this issue with public authorities. The invitation of a representative of the French federation of NGOs for development, Coordination Sud, into the working group ("Landau Group") set up by President Jacques Chirac, permitted the transmission of proposals from French civil society in a more efficient and organized way. The adoption of such a function by an association leadership poses several problems. If the principles of international taxation are largely shared by the body of actors making up the national NGO platforms active in the campaign, the shape to give its early pilot stages, which demand a certain amount of compromise bearing on the longer-term prospects, is unlikely to be so readily agreed. The determination of a common position is a delicate process needing leaders trusted by and sensitive to the platforms, to be undertaken on the basis of written premises. This, along with successive validation (i.e. a continual flow of communication amongst civic actors) will help avoid ambiguity and ensure common values.

### ***What are the most pertinent levels of mobilization and structuring of coalitions?***

The campaign evidence brought forward during the seminar showed to what extent civil society actors consider a methodical multi-layered mobilization to be necessary:

- National federations have the fundamental role of negotiating with their governments, as taxation remains above all a national question, subjected to rules of national democracy and at the heart of each country's sovereignty. Therefore, the first stage of the campaign consisted in establishing a collaboration between representatives of national coalitions and public authorities in order to arrive at common perspectives on international taxation.



- The existence of regional coalitions, especially at European and Latin American levels, allowed this undertaking to be handed over to the federations of other countries in order to bring about the awareness of foreign civil societies.
- Finally, the international level made it possible to speak with one voice to international institutions, and to engage regional coalitions. Creating an international resource center made up of national NGO federations (Coordination Sud, ABONG, etc.) and funded by the UNPD, is one of the tools that allowed for a common articulation. The objective of the resource center is to circulate information more effectively between coalition members in order to reinforce their capacity to determine common positions on the important issues facing them. On a theme as technical as the creation of a new taxation structure, the existence of a tool for the popularization and diffusion of information is an indispensable kingpin in a new international coalition.

More generally, even if the existence of a global civil society is not recognized by all, the globalization of advocacy is developing ways to articulate civil society voices, as evidenced in other fields such as the creation of new federative structures at the CGLU (Cities and Local Governments United) or the CSI (International Trade-Union Confederation).

### ***What alliances can be established with other civil society actors?***

One of the favorable results of these coalitions within the campaign was precisely their capacity to ally with other civil society actors, whose profiles and perspectives are often different. The collaboration of Coordination Sud and ATTAC, particularly within the "Landau Group" is one example. At the same time, we can observe that the NGO coalitions and the NGO networks divide the tasks within the campaign: while the national platforms participate directly in the meetings and ensure the role of running and coordinating the Pilot Groups, the specialized networks bring a specific expertise and run larger campaigns within their countries. This complementarity between a transversal approach and more punctual contributions, between an approach oriented directly towards lobbying and a wider public campaign, is a fundamental factor of the first favorable results achieved in this campaign.

In the same fashion, the presence of trade-union organizations in the negotiations was an important element in the development of

the campaign: on the specific issue of airplane ticket taxation, the involvement of the airline trade unions played a decisive role in defusing internal incomprehension and protests.

## **The triggers of media mobilization on a relatively technical issue**

### ***Simplify issues; modify their presentation to democratize them?***

In terms of media mobilization, this campaign also has much to teach us. The seminar debates came back several times to the idea of simplifying ideas and campaign propositions to make them more accessible to public opinion. Simplification is necessary, but arguable, because it can weaken the credibility of the advocate and give a helping hand to scientific criticism from the opposition. The campaign "International Taxation" concentrated its media communication less on the specific mechanisms of an international tax and how to collect it and more on the kind of financing it would allow. The possibility of a new and more stable source towards financing development, as well as financing global public goods, specifically in the fields of environment and health, were the main elements highlighted in the media. An entire aspect of the campaign, dealing with the role of the tax itself in respect to international transactions as well as long term perspectives for the construction of a wider international taxation were left in the background so that public opinion could relate to more concrete objective and mobilize for this cause. In the same fashion the potential role of the tax in the regulation of financial transactions was underplayed. Some participants, in particular Roberto Bissio of the organization Social Watch, advocate the introduction of this last theme to the media because this would allow the larger public to become aware of the scale of the informal economy and monetary transfers that largely elude control.

Another significant media related element brought up by this campaign was the publication of a report on international taxation produced by the "Landau Group". This report achieved a fairly wide distribution largely because it was endorsed by the President of France. The collaboration between civil society members and the President was therefore an important factor for the press in dealing with an issue that it had often not completely grasped.

If media attention appears to be an important asset for international level mobilization in this campaign, the more general question of using the media caused controversy during the seminar. Bill Pace, of the World Federalist Movement, for example, indicated that during the campaign concerning the creation of an International Penal Court, the use of media was carefully and voluntarily avoided. Too large exposure of the issues and development of the campaign could have worked in opposition to its objectives.

### **The active role of universities and think tanks in parallel to the campaign**

In such a technical undertaking, expertise as a resource, and especially theoretical expertise is widely used. The presence of academics, especially economists, within the "Landau Group" working alongside civil servants, representatives from banking and industry as well as civil society demonstrates the central role of universities in this field. Furthermore, the collaboration between NGO and academics was organized long before the working group was established. The collaboration between the ATTAC network and academics such as Lieven Denys of the Free University of Brussels allowed for the elaboration of precise scenarios for new tax systems. Referring to the thinking of well-known economists such as Paul Bernd Spahn of the University of Frankfurt was also central to the credibility of the positions taken by civil society actors.

The use of think tank expertise remains very much an Anglo-Saxon practice. Regarding this new form of taxation, the North-South Institute produced influential reports at Canadian level but also more widely for the whole of global civil society active in this field. Another example of specific recourse to think tank expertise is the collaboration between British civil society actors and the think tank Intelligence Capital Limited (ICL) in the specific context of exchange transaction taxation. As a financial consulting company, the main mission of ICL is proposing new financial approaches to help develop the economic potential of its clients. The two points of view are very different. However, the expertise of ICL could be tapped for the international taxation campaign because of the personal engagement of its director Avinash Persaud within the campaign.

Several actors repeatedly raised in debate the issue of universities and think tanks' monopoly on expertise and affirmed the necessity to develop a new form of expertise (frequently brought up by ATTAC

and Gus Massiah's CRID ), citizen expertise. The question remains as to what specific tools are needed to allow the emergence of this expertise on such a technical topic, in terms of training and circulation of information.

### **III. The Information and Communication Technologies Campaign**



# The Politics and Issues of Internet Governance

by *Milton L. Mueller*

The Internet emerged in the 1990s as a thoroughly transnational infrastructure for communication and commerce. All three components of Prof. Jan Aart Scholte's definition of global civil society are visible in Internet governance:

- It requires civic groups (as well as governments and business) to regularly "deal with cross-border questions"
- It involves intensive "use of transnational modes of communication"
- Civil society activities related to the Internet have, more often than not, "cross-border solidarity" as a premise

In fact, Scholte's concept of "cross-border" seems too pallid and weak when speaking of the Internet. "Non-bordered" or "radically re-bordered" might be better. With Internet we are often dealing with communicative activity that has little relation to territorial boundaries but follows its own virtual, networked structure. At other times we are forced by policy conflicts and governance vacuums to ask whether national borders should be actively re-asserted by technical means in order to regain control that was lost during the Internet's accidental rise.

## **Internet as a tool supporting policy action vs. Internet as an object of policy action**

Much of the literature on global civil society and networking has focused on the use of the Internet by activist groups. This report is not primarily concerned with the Internet as a tool; rather, it examines the ways in which transnational policies are fostered by contention over the substantive policy issues raised by the growth of the global Internet itself. Digital networking is not an exogenous, taken-for-granted feature of the international environment. It is a capability whose form is relentlessly targeted by interest groups, governments, public policy makers, and civil society activists. These political actors strive to shape the availability, cost, openness, freedom, privacy, content or some other aspect of the Internet's performance or structure. The growing importance of the "information sector" in the overall economy and society raises the stakes of these efforts.

## What's behind the notion of Internet Governance?

One can look at the public policy issues fostered by the internet in two distinct ways. One can see in them continuations of long-term issues in mass media and telecommunication regulation and technology policy that emerged from the era of nation-states. On the other hand, one can also see how digital convergence and the global nature of the Internet pose new problems in public policy and regulation, and how they challenge old policy paradigms and old institutions. It is best to keep both perspectives in mind.

"Internet governance" used to just mean ICANN-related issues; today, we include under that rubric almost any policy issue related to the Internet, including standardization and resource allocation. The Internet can be and is being used to provide mail, voice telephone service, newspapers, broadcast television, music, libraries, and government services. This unification of the platform for all modes of communication and information – known as "digital convergence" – makes all the policy conflicts and issues that were spread out over old media part of Internet politics today.

Thus, in addition to the need for globally coordinated assignment and allocation of Internet name and address resources, and the dominant position of one government, the United States, in that process, there are: tensions between Internet "haves" and "have-nots;" jurisdictional conflicts among states over control of online expression; battles over the protection of trademarks and copyrighted material online; battles over the openness or proprietary nature of standards; multilingualism in Internet standards; conflicts among industry, users and states over online surveillance and privacy; the need to control transborder spam and cyber-crime; and others.

But it would be wrong to look at these as an unconnected grab-bag of "issues." In reality they reflect a more coherent structure of geopolitical conflict over the growing importance of online interactions in commerce, culture, government and education, and over the distinctly transnational environment fostered by the internet. The best way to understand this holistically is to briefly recount what happened around the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS).



## **The World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS)**

The push for a global Summit on information society issues came in 2001, when the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) succeeded in linking the promotion of information and communication technology to the development goals of the United Nations Millennium Declaration. Feeding on concerns about a “global digital divide,” WSIS was intended to highlight the importance of the ITU and to marshal corporate and state support for the finance and construction of telecommunication and information infrastructure in undeveloped and developing countries. The self-declared purpose of WSIS was “to formulate a common vision and understanding of the global information society,” and to “harness the potential of knowledge and technology to promote the development goals of the Millennium Declaration.”

As WSIS unfolded, its agenda morphed in two important ways. First, public interest advocacy groups – transnational in scope and emboldened by the burgeoning anti-globalization movements at the turn of the century – mobilized around WSIS. Attendance statistics show that their efforts attracted a growing number of non-state actors into the process. The civil society activists tried to broaden the scope of the discussions beyond the construction of infrastructure, promoting a broad range of equity and human rights claims related to communication-information policy. They also set up their own internal organizational structures and, under the rubric “WSIS Civil Society,” strove to intervene in the process as the peers of governments and business.

Another unexpected turn came when conflicts among states over the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), came to dominate the WSIS agenda. In so doing, WSIS inaugurated an explicit debate over the role of the nation-state in Internet governance generally. It did this first by openly challenging the institutional innovation that was ICANN, and then by broadening the discussion into an attempt to define the proper “roles and responsibilities” of governments with respect to other “stakeholder groups.” This fostered a new politics by forcing governments, business and civil society to confront both the de facto privatization of many aspects of Internet governance and the contradiction between the territorial jurisdiction of the nation-state and the globalized communication and information flows facilitated by the Internet.

Once WSIS became preoccupied with Internet governance, it created a special working group, the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG), to discuss and debate what seemed to be an intractable problem. The composition of the 40-person WGIG was almost equally divided between governments, business and civil society, and all its members had equal status in the discussions. The civil society representatives on the WGIG were, for the most part, nominated to the Secretariat by the organically evolved structures of WSIS civil society. The civil society WGIG participants were often the best informed and most active and influential members. The final product of the Summit, the Tunis Agenda, mandated the creation of an "Internet Governance Forum," perpetuating a multi-stakeholder policy discussion arena based on the WGIG model. The overall effect was not just an endorsement but an implementation of the multi-stakeholder model of governance within the UN system. Similarly, ICANN's private sector-led, multi-stakeholder approach to the administration of Internet identifiers survived the WSIS challenge – although it became much more beholden to states. Thus, the multi-stakeholder approach was legitimized and the structures of civil society participation took some halting steps toward institutionalization.

### **Social movement or issue network?**

In the field of communication-information policy, there is no coherent social movement around Internet governance per se, the way there is, e.g., around issues of gender or environmentalism. Not yet. We have, instead, a very high-level problématique coupled with a diverse group of distinct issue networks formed around an earlier world's segmentation of the policy domain and prior institutional venues. The World Summit on the Information Society, however, brought these issue networks together around a common framing (the "information society") and an integrated institutional environment (a UN Summit process that provided a role for civil society participation) for the first time. It therefore led to some convergence and cross-fertilization of these issue networks.

- The civil society issue networks implicated in Internet governance can be listed as follows (see Table 1):
- ICANN civil society
- Free software, open access to knowledge movement
- Digital Rights (civil liberties – human rights networks)

- Media policy and alternative media production groups
- ICT4D groups (Information and Communication Technology for Development)

Since the end of WSIS and the creation of the IGF, we can see some initial signs of continued convergence, as the civil society groups focused on intellectual property issues and WIPO on the one hand, and on WSIS, ICANN and Internet governance on the other, have come closer together. (It is worth noting that Veronique believes, in contrast to this, that civil society lacks pre-eminence in the IGF and is overshadowed by governments and business, and that WSIS civil society has little interest in Internet governance issues.)

Of these groups, according to our research, only the free software/A2K groups truly have the status of a social movement. The model of open, online-based collaboration using a legal framework that makes work product into a “commons” has proven its viability in software production, and has since spread virally into many other areas. Through processes of replication and convergence it is expanding the range of policy issues and international organizations affected. In particular, civil society groups have made headway in the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO/OMPI) by allying with developing countries to favor information access over copyright and patent protection.

The ICANN-related civil society groups, despite dealing with a highly technical and narrow set of issues, have emerged as the core of internet governance-related activity focused on reform of global institutions. ICANN as a global governance institution is important because it is one of the few centralized points of leverage for making globally applicable public policy related to the internet. It is also important as an attempt to create a new, truly global governance model. Initially it pushed away governments, directly involved civil society, and incorporated notions of direct democracy into its Board selection process. Thus, CS actors involved in ICANN have been dealing with the problems of globalized governance, multi-stakeholderism and civil society self-organization for some time, as well as having a much stronger understanding of the ways in which a technological leverage point was being used by the US and private corporations to erect an apparatus of global governance. This has enlarged their role in the post-WSIS debates on Internet governance beyond their numerical strength.

A large civil society network with many INGOs, ICT4D is almost an industry unto itself. Its members and organizations are well-integrated into the processes and funding mechanisms of the United Nations system. This issue network provided one of the main sources of participation in WSIS from the "global South" and had very close relations to government and intergovernmental organizations. Exemplar organizations include African Civil Society for the Information Society, IT for Change (India), UNECA, Francophonie, UNDP, Asia Pacific Development Information Project, some Canadian development agencies.

## **Looking ahead**

Currently we are, frankly, in a reactionary time as far as the broad sweep of global governance of communication-information policy is concerned. The disruption and innovation that was the early Internet has set in motion strong efforts by the disrupted interests – especially intellectual property holders, national governments, national security and surveillance agencies – to reassert control or to create new forms of control that harness the Internet to suit their own interests. A recent book praises a "bordered" Internet and claims that only traditional national states can produce the public goods needed to maintain order in cyberspace. (Goldsmith and Wu, 2006) Among state actors, the appetite for institutional innovations seems to have disappeared. In the post-9/11 world, "security" has become the watchword and all kinds of new forms of inter-state, transnational governance networks are being formed behind closed doors, with little accountability and not much public input. However, communication-information policy as a distinct field for policy and advocacy is gaining recognition.

## Issue networks in Internet Governance

Frame(s)	Issue areas	Institutional venues	CS Groups Involved
"Internet governance"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policies for allocation and assignment of Internet identifier resources</li> <li>- Linkage of identifier issues to human rights issues</li> <li>- The scope and mechanisms for global governance; US pre-eminence</li> <li>- The roles of States, business, civil society, and individuals in global governance</li> </ul>	<p>ICANN</p> <p>US Govt.</p> <p>UN Internet Governance Forum (IGF)</p> <p>[ITU]</p>	<p>IG Caucus (WSIS CS)</p> <p>Internet Governance Project (IGP);</p> <p>IP Justice;</p> <p>APC;</p> <p>RITS;</p> <p>Diplo</p>
<p>"A2K" (Access to Knowledge)</p> <p>"Copyfight"</p> <p>"Free/Libre Software"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Open access to information vs. intellectual property protection</li> <li>- Software patents and copyrights</li> <li>- Voluntary commons construction</li> <li>- DRM resistance</li> <li>Nonproprietary standards</li> </ul>	<p>The GPL</p> <p>WIPO</p> <p>National Govts</p> <p>UN CSTD</p>	<p>CP Tech;</p> <p>Creative Commons;</p> <p>Public Knowledge;</p> <p>FSF (US, Europe, Latin Am.);</p> <p>EFF</p>
<p>"Human Rights"</p> <p>"Digital Rights"</p> <p>"Civil liberties"</p> <p>"Anti-censorship"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Internet censorship</li> <li>- Content rating standards</li> <li>- Blocking and filtering of Internet content</li> <li>- Privacy and surveillance</li> <li>- Digital identity</li> </ul>	<p>National Govt's</p> <p>IGF</p> <p>ICANN</p>	<p>OpenNet Initiative;</p> <p>EDRI;</p> <p>RSF;</p> <p>APC;</p> <p>EPIC;</p> <p>Privacy Internat'l;</p> <p>Amnesty Internat'l</p>
<p>"Media Reform"</p> <p>"Communication Rights"</p> <p>"Community media"</p> <p>"Alternative media"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Economic and content regulation of media companies</li> <li>- Concentration of media ownership</li> <li>- Bias in media content</li> <li>- Net neutrality</li> <li>- Radio spectrum policy</li> </ul>	<p>National Govt's</p> <p>UNESCO</p>	<p>Free Press</p> <p>CRIS Campaign</p> <p>AMARC</p> <p>Indymedia</p>



# **Global civil societies and WSIS: actors, visions, methods and strategies towards what governance?**

*by Veronique Kleck*

## **The notion of 'global civil societies': the concept and the actors**

The very concept of civil society is extremely vague and fluid. It could be considered as a perpetual transformation or evolution, the components of which are in a constant state of modification depending on their structures, themes, challenges...

Civil society itself is a notion with blurred demarcations, reflecting the ambiguity in which we all evolve. It involves an amalgamation of protagonists, sometimes, though not always, including representatives of movements belonging neither to the state nor to private industry. Realistically, it might involve those individuals having exercised a professional role either within government or within private industry; they could even have their own audit firm.

These ambiguities surrounding the notion of 'civil society' reflect the difficulty in classifying the contemporary developments within it. The same goes for governance, which is a process essential to becoming a state. This vagueness informs the research, the trials and the experiments undertaken to create a more efficient state, to create a new relationship with the ruling power. In the digital age, forms of government are constantly adapting and transforming.

If we consider the notion of civil society through the WSIS case study, 'the civil society' is a diverse assembly of groups, networks and movements, containing a variety of viewpoints and positions on practically all of the subjects on the agenda at the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). It includes, among others, the representatives of essentially 'professional' NGOs, the Trade Union movement, community-based media, traditional media interest-groups, members of parliament and the representatives of local government, the scientific and academic community, educationalists, librarians, charity-workers, the movement for disability rights, activists for youth issues, associations supporting indigenous communities, think-tanks,

philanthropic foundations, the women's liberation movement and the defenders of human rights and freedom of expression.

Within the context of the summit, civil society consisted of, both the block of NGO movements - associations that were entirely different (as much in their status as in their claims, that is to say in their action strategies) AND a 'club of international leaders', activists and consultants connected or not to these movements.

Naturally, a new political team or 'staff' emerged from these networks. It was thus that we observed an 'enlightened avant-garde', who benefited from both political and technical legitimacy. Often historically involved in these movements, they had acquired an internal 'validation' label from the rest of the group. Other skills lent weight to their legitimacy, such as their flair for writing, communications or public speaking, their knowledge of foreign languages, as well as their availability to participate in preparatory talks for the WSIS for the four preceding years.

To my mind, it is increasingly important to recognize these leaders, since they are the very same who will be present at the Summit as civil society representatives within the Internet Governance Forum (IGF).

### **The internet as both tool and object of militant protest**

From a historical perspective, the media and social struggles have always gone hand in hand. Information and communication have been simultaneously the instruments and the objects of various struggles. Today, innovation has seen the internet revolution multiply the two 'roles' of the media tenfold, making it both a tool of liberation and of domination. I find that there is a fine line between the internet-tool of protest and the internet-object of protest. We use the 'tool-internet' to further the construction of the 'object-internet'.

### **Civil society and the governance of the internet**

Within the WSIS, civil society ascribes a political dimension to information societies before exploring the technical aspect of these same societies.

Milton's presentation explains succinctly the gap between an exclusively technical approach to 'Internet Governance' (understood as ICANN-related issues) and an expanded approach to this internet governance, embracing a 'wide variety of policy issues.'



Questions linked to internet governance in the restrictive sense of the term 'ICANN issues' are simply a small part of the various concerns of the actors within civil society. As Milton emphasizes, the majority of actors concentrate their demands on the democracy of access to and use of networks, the cost of access, its role in education and the dissemination of research, aid to handicapped peoples, the struggle against poverty, potential contributions towards literacy, assistance in the creation of new activities, of new economic models, etc... These efforts are very rarely directed towards the attribution of domain names ending in .fr or .org, or against the spread of spam.

For the majority of actors within civil society, questions regarding internet governance are largely perceived as extremely or abnormally technical, in that they can be cloaked in specifications, protocols and other juridico-technical arrangements that make it difficult to distinguish the political issue at stake, such as freedom of speech, the notion of (private and public) data protection, free access to networks etc.

This approach can be explained primarily by the chronology of actions carried out by representatives of this, the global civil society. At the very root of this global civil society, within the domain of digital networks and communications, we find many movements that are based on what Milton would term 'continuations of long-term issues in mass-media and telecommunication regulation and technology policy'. Therefore, these movements and actors might easily integrate via their activities or demands: they can disseminate information on investments and usage, train users for these new instruments of information and communication, exchange and compare experiences and lessons on these new practices, assist decision-making, apply pressure and generally constitute an interface between practice and decisive political action. These are the collectives that aim to promote egalitarian access to digital networks, such as those associations supporting the dissemination of free software. These groups campaign for equal rights to communication, for the denunciation of racist or sexist content and for structured training schemes within the media.

These movements have, at best, been able to understand the challenges inherent to internet governance – although they have in their majority not sought profit – they are rarely involved in debates or in the working groups dedicated to 'ICANN issues.'

When examining the composition of the panels and of the different groups engaged in the IGF (Internet Governance Forum) – we

notice two things: the under-representation of civil society and its collaboration with private industry on the one hand, and, within this same civil society, the priority given to the representatives of 'techno' institutions and to university staff/ researchers.

### **The organization of global civil society at the WSIS: components and structures**

Our hypothesis is that global civil society would not have been able to emerge, define and organize itself unless it was actually obliged to. It was, in fact, the restrictions imposed by the United Nations that brought about the appearance of this new actor on the international scene.

The importance of communication networks was only rightly appreciated as a result of their involvement in the World Summit on the Information Society – and this as much in their own eyes as in the eyes of the public, the governments and the companies. For the first time in the history of world governance, a United Nations Summit opened the preparatory session to actors from the private sector as well as to those from the civil society. This gesture, of an inter-governmental organization opening itself to a non-governmental one, should be considered as the first step in the quest for a new kind of governance. It could be that in taking this courageous decision, Kofi Anam, Secretary General of the United Nations, was seeking to restore the legitimacy of the UN, which has never before been so seriously threatened.

It is important to recognize that this very UN Summit arose from a conflict within the organization, between pro Unesco and pro ITU factions. What is interesting about this is that across these two bodies, there are two conflicting perceptions of the Information Society struggling for ascendancy: the humanist vision and the technical vision. We know that it is this second vision that succeeded, at the wish of the coalitions of private enterprises and governments. Meanwhile, civil society, with the support of certain governments depending on the themes, tended to prioritize the human aspect within these information societies.

The Summit had a determinant and binding effect on the formulation of recommendations. Yet one of the most interesting contributions involved the processes and the procedures put in place by 'civil society', as much to organize their work as to resolve the questions of

legitimacy and representation in their recommendations and official declarations. This, for us, constitutes a real methodological advance and the creation of a true laboratory for global governance.

The 'leaders' of militant movements have set up 'bodies' responsible for developing civil society input and ensuring its continued representation. Put simply, three principal bodies can be identified:

- A full assembly: this is the ruling instance for civil society; open to all potential participants, physically or virtually, most of its deliberation takes place online.
- A coordination group, named 'content and themes' group responsible for the proposals, originating from the thematic groups (human rights, the disabled...) and of the caucus representing the different civil society 'families' (unions, university staff...).
- A civil society office charged with all relations with the inter-governmental office, regarding logistic and procedural issues. This office, composed of twenty-one representatives from the thematic groups and caucus, will act under the authority of the full assembly.

### **The strategic civil society approach: institutionalization**

- Such an organization, endorsed by the other actors – governments and members of the private sector involved in the summit, represents a huge effort of collective understanding between members of civil society and has greatly contributed to its 'legitimacy'. These structures and operational modes have allowed for the production of numerous proposals and practical recommendations. The elaboration and dissemination of the declaration 'Defining Information Societies centered on Human Requirements' during the Geneva Summit emphasized the political maturity of civil society actors and gave them a sound status within the context of the summit.
- The civil society office represents a significant political advance. For the first time in the history of the United Nations, infrastructures have been created to associate it with civil society, simultaneously institutionalizing its participation in the summit and creating a precedent for future meetings.
- Presumably, the supposed goal of this 'civil society' was to privilege certain aspects that may have been insufficiently accounted

for, but equally to perceive itself as able to take action, through mobilization, regarding political negotiations. The desire of these actors was to transform the system and its institutions in order to change political processes and the decisions subsequently taken. To do this, their first step was to institutionalize and to integrate themselves into the existing processes. Only the future will tell if these strategic choices will engender a degree of political innovation. For the time being, we can refer to the in-depth analysis performed following the summit on this participation of the civil society in the non-governmental negotiations.

### **After the summit... and beyond**

To conclude, we can say that this WSIS is the first UN summit to conceive of civil society as a 'separate actor in its entirety', and, with regards to its organization and its production, that it marks an important shift in international governance. The balance of strength and power is shifting and civil society seems to be called to play an increasingly important role in the definition of a new public space, which will transcend national frontiers. But this role must still materialize. This is certainly the sentiment arising from this summit and other growing trends.

More than a year and a half after the end of the summit, the place and role of civil society is far from being firmly anchored, either in the follow-up and the implementation of the conclusions of the summit or in the Forum on Internet Governance.

The implementation of the results of the Tunis summit were entrusted to the ITU (International Telecommunications Union), more specifically to its economic and social council, via its commission on science and technology for development. The subsequent recognition of the involvement of civil society necessitated a reform of this commission; in February 2006 the first consultations showed evidence of serious reticence from the governments regarding the implication of civil society and in July 2006 even the role of observer for members of civil society was being debated and contested by certain governments.

As far as the implementation of the Internet Governance Forum went, the Secretary General of the United Nations endeavored to put together a team of experts comprising forty-five members. Yet again, only seven members of civil society were appointed. The governments had nineteen seats at their disposal, the private sector had ten

and the representatives of ICANN, a quasi-public institution with strong links to American interests, had nine seats. The inaugural meeting of this forum in October 2006 confirmed the predominance of government and market interests in this debate.

Only the Alliance for Information and Communication Technology for Development (a new structure launched in June 2006 by the United Nations) seems, from its inception, to favor the multi-partner approach of the WSIS. In the composition of its various institutions civil society is represented in equal number.

### **Philosophy, Politics and Information as a common good**

A phenomenon is well underway that cannot be ignored: citizen resistance is growing and aims to link up these smaller, individual movements, and to associate them with social movements leading other protests, such as the fight for human rights or for the protection of the environment. They are all united in the same struggle for the democratization of communications and information, a cornerstone of democratic society.

Therefore, across the trans-national, the national and the local space new regulators and seats of power will emerge. Today, the old and the new must fight to gain or maintain power. We are in an age of interdependent decision-making and multiple institutions. And if no solution can be found, democratic crisis is sure to follow.

This is why it is absolutely necessary to work towards the conception of a new political philosophy in order to regulate our networked societies, and to define their values before legislating about human relations.

In this context, there is a cautious shift towards the issue of information as a common good, which could allow for the realization of an oft quoted but never-achieved objective which consists in drawing nearer to the social movements not directly implicated in the challenges inherent to communication. These alliances represent the major target to achieve today.

All of these movements working on questions regarding internet governance should link up with other social movements, or even become parts of them. Some of them are already working in this direction, for example, the Association for Community Radio, representing 3000 community radios, who recently mobilized on the issue

of global commerce agreements, as well as on the international debate on cultural diversity. These movements also have to consider communication as an object of social struggles, not just a tool.

The key to reconciliation lies in conceiving information as a stake for power. In fields as varied as access to healthcare and medicine, the right to healthy produce, the fight against famine, the preservation of natural resources, the right to education, to training and to knowledge, to free universal access to culture in all its guises, the same priorities present themselves: human development and the conservation of our planet. The notion of information as a common good would serve to gather together all those who aim to construct a responsible and interdependent world.

### Sources:

UN General Assembly Resolution 56/183 (21 December 2001)

A detailed appendix on the notion of NGOs and the civil society is included in the introductory kit for the summit organized by CONGO, the coordinating body of the NGOs at the UN. [http://www.ngocongo.org/files/smis\\_kit\\_d\\_orientation.pdf](http://www.ngocongo.org/files/smis_kit_d_orientation.pdf)

see [http://www.intgovforum.org/PL\\_Feb13.html](http://www.intgovforum.org/PL_Feb13.html) and the list of participants of the control group from the Athens meeting who are preparing for the next meeting of the IGF in Rio in November 2007 <http://www.intgovforum.org/list%20of%20panellists.php>

Resolution 56/183 of the general assembly of the United Nations, [www.itu.int/wsis/docs/background/resolutions/56\\_183\\_unga\\_2002.pdf](http://www.itu.int/wsis/docs/background/resolutions/56_183_unga_2002.pdf)

On the process of the WSIS we can refer back to the study by Mark Raboy and Normand Landry, *Communication at the Heart of Global Governance, challenges and perspectives of the civil society at the WSIS*, Department of Communication, Montreal, 2004.

<http://www.lrpc.umontreal.ca/smsirapport.pdf>, completed in the appendix

<http://www.lrpc.umontreal.ca/smsiannexes.pdf>, in addition to the work of Valery Peugeot, Relieurs, available on [vecm.org/article.php3?id\\_article=364](http://vecm.org/article.php3?id_article=364), 2004

The totality of these bodies put in place by civil society is largely detailed in the introductory kit for the global summit, organized by CONGO ([http://www.ngocongo.org/files/smis/\\_kit\\_d\\_orientation.pdf](http://www.ngocongo.org/files/smis/_kit_d_orientation.pdf))

Civil Society declaration 'Defining Information Societies centered on Human Requirements' [http://www.worldsummit2003.de/download\\_en/WSIS-CS-Dec-121103-fr.pdf](http://www.worldsummit2003.de/download_en/WSIS-CS-Dec-121103-fr.pdf)

See specifically Mark Raboy and Normand Landry op. cit.; Valerie Peugeot, Relieurs, op. cit. An evaluation of the evolution of relations between NGOs and the United Nations was made by Tony Hill 'Three Generations of UN-Civil Society Relations: A Quick Sketch' UN-NGLS, March 2004, included in the introductory kit organized by CONGO.

Information on this meeting can be accessed at <http://www.itu.int/reform/Council-Res-1224/index.html>, <http://www.itu.int/reform>

[www.intgovforum.org](http://www.intgovforum.org) [www.igfgreece2006.gr](http://www.igfgreece2006.gr) and <http://www.intgovforum.org>

<http://www.un-gaid.org>

## Review of the debates

The majority of civil society organizations leading campaigns of action in alternative fields are not fully aware of the debate centered on matters of access, utilization and the regulation of communication and information technologies. The recognition of this particular field and its respective issues is still developing.

Responses to a questionnaire circulated before the seminar demonstrated that ICTs were unanimously viewed as essential campaign tools by the participants (as dissemination aids, as tools for developing networks and alliances and as tools for promoting transparency in the public sector). Yet the debates raised at this seminar have also resulted in the conclusion that the ICTs are also the object of their own campaign: the governance of the Internet.

The major issues raised concerning the ICT campaign provided an opportunity for the attending actors from civil society to understand the importance of the complementarity of this specific campaign to many other campaigns evoked during the seminar. The multiplicity of civic organizations involved was also revealed, both those directly linked to international organizations like the Internet Governance Forum and those operating outside campaigning for "fairer governance" of the Internet such as the Global Alliance for ICT and Development. Institutions particularly committed to the cause like the Ford Foundation, Swedish SIDA, or Canadian CRDI/IDRC, go to great lengths to involve civil society in these negotiations, as was the case during the World Summit for the Information Society.

The case studies largely focused on the new role taken on by civil society organizations within the summit, a role which is no longer that of an illicit visitor, but, on the contrary, that of an official interlocutor who is broadly represented during the debates. We will come back to the consequences of this new position of civil society within the official decision-making process of the international community throughout the course of this review of the major issues.

Among the participants of this seminar, many were able to share their direct or indirect experiences in these campaigns; notably Milton Mueller (School of Information Studies at the University of Syracuse), Véronique Kleck of the association VECAM in France, Willie Currie of the APC, Sean O'Siochru of the campaign Communication Rights in the Information Society (CRIS) and Dipankar Sinha of the University of Calcutta.

## What sort of participation strategy?

The issue of the contradictory dynamics of collaboration/confrontation was a recurrent theme during the debates. Yet this is a relatively new question within the discussions being held concerning the campaigns for the regulation of the ICT. The UN summit endeavored to integrate the actors of civil society into a “multi-partner” decision-making process, effectively rendering them fully-fledged interlocutors within the summit. However, the testimonial of Sean O Siochru provides a glimpse of a very mixed result regarding the true participation of the actors at the summit: he bemoans the absence of a clear protocol which would serve to accredit the actors and their modes of participation.

The implementation of a “Bureau for civil society” (initiated during the second preparatory meeting for the summit) the involvement of these actors in round table debates and the formulation of official declarations at the plenary meetings are tantamount to a form of “institutionalization of participation” of the civil society, as outlined by Véronique Kleck in the previous pages. Obviously this is a positive example, in terms of reinforcing the voice and the influence of civil society actors. It does not address the questions regarding the nomination of civil society’s official representatives and the internal methods of organization implemented to ensure the fair representation of the actors present. There is, on the one hand, a question of geographical representation, since the summit was constructed around regional conferences treating the issues and the priorities of different areas (Africa, Asia-Pacific, etc.) and on the other hand, a question of thematic representation, since the summit addresses vastly differing themes and subject.

The question of the efficiency of an official representation, and its articulation with a more informal “networking” activity during the summit has also been raised. During the inter-session meetings (notably at the July 2003 meeting in Paris) actors from civil society were formally excluded from the work groups. These meetings were, however, an opportunity for them to exert an important influence on negotiations, indirectly providing the delegates with their expertise.

In addition to this, the negotiation and discussion framework implemented in the summit for civil society actors was characterized by multiple levels of discussion and coordination, and proved a fundamental difficulty for these actors to put forward a coherent presentation of their common objectives and activities.



## **A real or a superficial unity of civil society?**

The abovementioned case studies highlight the wide diversity of actors mobilized around ICTs, but also the important difference between their objectives. At the heart of this diversity, there is the distinction between the social and developmental approach to the ICTs and the technical question of the tools themselves. Véronique Kleck is keen to underline this distinction: in her opinion the real challenge of this debate is not so much the purely technical aspect of the ICTs but the social shift that these new tools will engender. Even among those who promote a 'social' approach to these matters, the diversity of profiles and goals is striking: from legal questions regarding the protection of software and content, to economic questions regarding the regulation of the media itself, or even questions regarding the infrastructure of tools enabling Internet access. (The diversity of the profiles involved is more specifically highlighted in Milton Mueller's study).

Essentially, the conclusion of this session is that the linking of different varieties of themes is largely born of the institutional framework provided by the WISIS, rather than a true grasp of the different issues at stake for the actors involved and the desire to work towards these together. Véronique Kleck stresses the danger of an artificial and short-term coalition, in which the dynamics of exchange and dialogue are restricted to the life of the Summit. Even the attitude of civil society organizations toward the UN's disciplinary system illustrates this fragility: certain NGOs were present during the preparatory process, others quickly walked out, others organized their activities on the fringe of the summit. The WISIS experience raises the question of the mechanics of constructing a coalition of civil society actors, and the potential viability of this coalition. Exterior pressures can often compel coalitions to embrace essentially superficial collaborations. That said, this exterior pressure is often an opportunity for these actors to familiarize themselves with each other, to recognize their peers, and its purpose in the domain is important. Additionally, and in parallel to the official activities of the summit, actors from civil society have tried to organize high-profile events, inviting the general public (and other actors present) to learn about their activities and their position. The World Forum on Communication Rights, the Community Media Forum and the Media Liberties in the Information Society were notable examples of this dynamics, during the summit in Geneva.

Concerning the efficiency of a coalition of civil society with regards to the ICT campaign, an important need was mentioned repeatedly, that is the presence of 'political' figures capable of bridging the gap between the demands of the civil society and the arenas of international negotiations. The nomination of spokespersons during the official plenary meetings was a long and complex process, the goal being to identify individuals who would have the requisite political profile, while still able to represent impartially the views of civil society actors.

### **An ambiguous relationship with “the media”**

The major issues of the ICT campaigns are predominantly diffusion and access to information; the role of the media itself is thus integral to this matter. A large part of the advocacy argument is actually transmitted via the new tools of the citizen's Internet (blogs, specialist sites) and community-based media which are expanding rapidly at present. These movements have effectively mobilized public opinion, getting around the problem of dissemination by established and traditional media. In doing this, they are able to exert more stringent control over the information that they wish to broadcast. The true impact of this new tool for dissemination remains to be seen – and its legitimacy when compared to traditional media, in the eyes of the public to be confirmed.

Furthermore, actors from the traditional media sector were involved in the WSIS. This is notably the case of the French monthly publication *Le Monde Diplomatique*. Another important actor in the traditional media sector is the Agence InterPress Service, whose work involves the transmission of news from southern countries on an international level, as well as to these countries themselves. The media players involved in the campaign are therefore niche actors, who follow quite a specific political line. The question of the transmission of the major issues in debate to more generalist, broadly read media, remains open.

## **Which short and long-term strategies?**

Throughout the seminar, the marked clash between the necessity for change and short-term results, and the reality of a potentially lengthy process (which is characteristic of international institutional and political shifts) became ever more clear. This trade-off is even more significant in the case of the ICT campaigns.

Indeed, in the domain of ICT, the rapid development of tools and modes of production demands updated regulations and a consensus on standardized controls to apply in this domain. Yet the institutionalization of these common regulations is a lengthy procedure, the mobilization of public and private actors is a complex process – all of the above cannot be implemented in less than 15-20 years, according to many of the seminar's participants.

At present, many participants defend the notion of the Internet as a global public good, and, as with water or land, efforts are being made by public authorities and economic actors to improve and democratize access to the Internet. As long as only 5% of citizens in developing countries have access to the internet, we can not yet talk, despite Dipankar Sinha's stated wishes, about "equal access".

## **Institute for Research and Debate on Governance:**

An international arena for exploring governance

The emergence of the notion of governance in national and international debate underscores a new conception of the power and collaboration relationships between the actors in the public sphere (State, local authorities, supranational organisations as well as civil society organisations and the private sector). This notion also conveys the common quest for new consultation and regulation models, more flexible and better adapted to the current trends of globalization and "localism".

Created at the instigation of the Charles Léopold Mayer Foundation in 2006, the Institute for Research and Debate on Governance (IRG) is a think tank pooling international, intercultural and interdisciplinary expertise. Based in Paris, its aim is to spearhead the debate on governance by opening gateways between academic research, national and international civil services, business, civil society organisations, etc.

By inviting this debate and as a result of the research, dissemination, expertise and training activities it entails, IRG strives to:

- Develop a systematic analysis of governance's major issues (the role of civil society and

of the private sector, the legitimacy of powers, the institutionalisation process, State reform, re-emergence of territories, etc.)

- Meet the requirements of institutions wishing to found their action and the recasting of their policies on the exchange of experiences, analyses and proposals addressing governance: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), French ministry of Foreign and European affairs, OECD, European Union, Ford Foundation, Swiss Cooperation, NGO federations, universities on several continents...

## PARTICIPANT LIST

**Patrice Barrat**, Bridge Initiative (Paris)  
**Roberto Bissio**, TWI - Social Watch (Uruguay)  
**Joji Carino**, Tebtebba Foundation (UK)  
**Louis Clark**, Government Accountability Project (Washington)  
**Willie Currie**, Association for Progressive Communication (New York)  
**Paul Dembinski**, Observatoire International de la Finance (Geneva)  
**Burkhard Gnärig**, Berlin Civil Society Center  
**Jesse Griffiths**, Action Aid (London)  
**Peter Hlobil**, CEE Bankwatch (Prague)  
**Corazon Juliano-Soliman**, Incite Government (The Philippines)  
**Yoko Kitazawa**, journalist (Japan)  
**Véronique Kleck**, VECAM (Paris)  
**Michael Likosky**, NYU Law School  
**Nigel Martin**, Forum International de Montréal  
**Gus Massiah**, CRID, AITEC (Paris)  
**Milton Mueller**, Syracuse University  
**Somrudee Nicro**, Thailand Environment Institute  
**Sean O'Siochru**, Nexus, CRIS (Ireland)  
**Bill Pace**, World Federalist Movement, Institute for Global Policy (New York/The Hague)  
**Bérengère Quincy**, French Foreign Ministry (Paris)  
**Henri Rouillé d'Orfeuil**, Coordination Sud (Paris)  
**Miguel Santibanez**, ACCION (Chile)  
**Dipankar Sinha**, University of Calcutta  
**Carin Smaller**, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (Geneva)  
**Mathew Stilwell**, Institute for Governance and Sustainable Development (Geneva)  
**Rajesh Tandon**, PRIA (New Delhi)  
**Steve Waddell**, GAN-Net (Boston)  
**Peter Wahl**, WEED (Berlin)  
**Hemantha Withanage**, NGO forum on ADP (The Philippines)  
**David Woodward**, New Economics Foundation (London)  
**Leonardo Burlamaqui**, Ford Foundation (New York)  
**Monica Brown**, Ford Foundation (New York)  
**Lisa Jordan**, Ford Foundation (New York)  
**Barbara Klugman**, Ford Foundation (New York)  
**Juliette Majol**, consultant (Berkeley)  
**Michel Sauquet**, IRG (Paris)  
**Martin Vielajus**, IRG (Paris)  
**Rita Savelis**, IRG (Paris)  
**Pascal Delisle**, IRG, Sciences Po (Paris)  
**Juliette Decoster**, FPH (Paris)  
**Pierre Calame**, FPH (Paris)





