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Introduction

Internet Governance is the development and application of shared principles, norms, rules, and decision-making processes that shape the evolution and use of the Internet. It is a complex system involving a multitude of stakeholders – governments, civil society, businesses, technical communities, etc. – and a range of mechanisms, procedures and instruments. While women's participation has increased over the years, women, gender and sexual minorities especially in the Global South, still remain underrepresented in Internet Governance processes, across stakeholder groups at national, regional and global levels. It is essential to integrate their perspectives into these conversations if the internet is to fulfill its transformational potential for all.

Internet Governance sounds abstract at first; hard to understand or influence. But this is an important political arena, especially as the world becomes increasingly digital. We want to build Internet Governance that is more responsive to the needs of diverse genders and sexualities. We want to infuse into Internet Governance - issues ranging from privacy and data collection, to access and freedom of expression and a range of issues in between - with a lens that is feminist and intersectional. We want to bridge the 'rights' divide between gender, sexuality and digital rights. And do all of this collectively, learning and strategising together.

As part of the Our Voices Our Futures collaboration with the Association For Progressive Communications (APC), Point of View organised gigX (Gender and Internet Governance Exchange) – a daylong workshop on demystifying Internet Governance and infusing gender into it. This was a learning workshop held in Delhi on 28 November, 2023, with organisations working with women, gender and sexual minorities – organisations who would like to understand Internet Governance, why this is relevant to our work and how to influence this critical policy-making domain. We had 30 participants from Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata, Goa, Bangalore and Shimla, including women, queer and trans folx.

The main objectives of gigX was to build capacities to enable such groups to meaningfully engage in Internet Governance spaces by:

1) Building knowledge and understanding of key concepts, processes, practices and politics of Internet Governance;

2) Building knowledge of emerging issues concerning Internet Governance, and how they impact women, girls, queer and trans folx, persons with disabilities and sex workers, through a feminist, intersectional lens;

3) Identifying gaps and trends, and exploring advocacy strategies to influence discourse on gender and sexual rights in Internet Governance spaces.

1 https://dig.watch/what-is-internet-governance-digital-policy
The day began with a session led by Smita V (Project Coordinator, Women’s Rights Programme, APC), where we navigated the physical infrastructure of the internet and looked at the journey that data takes while traveling across it. We did this through a game designed by Tactical Tech: in groups, participants arranged cards containing different components of the internet infrastructure, in the order in which they understood the internet to function.

Through this, we learned how the internet works as we browse and connect to websites, what information is collected along the way, depending on whether we navigate the internet via secure HTTP or insecure HTTPS connections or browse via VPNs, and use webmail. Participants learned about the workings of key components of the physical infrastructure ranging from computer, mobile phones and routers to national gateways, internet service providers and VPN providers. We looked at how mobile communication works, privacy implications for users as IP addresses are used to identify where devices are connecting from through their location.
data, and what it means in terms of privacy, access to information and expression, especially when it comes to things like the ‘porn ban’ in India and stringent laws on privacy that block torrent websites. We explored key concepts around data privacy, such as end-to-end encryption that prevents third parties from accessing data as it is transferred from one end system to another. But how meaningful is end-to-end encryption on platforms like WhatsApp that collect metadata that provides information about and contextualises our communications? We discussed some secure alternatives such as Signal that don’t collect metadata.

We discussed issues around power, ownership, coloniality, and experiences of access, privacy and security, and environmental costs related to how the internet is structured. We looked at how submarine fiber optic cables snake through the seas carrying telecommunication signals for the internet to function.

This comes with vulnerabilities around access, privacy and security, such as during natural disasters, wars, internet shutdowns. With companies taking over submarine cables for profit, what does it mean in terms of ownership of the Internet, which is a shared resource? Participants discussed issues around security risks and access through the example of China that offered to lay submarine cables in the Solomon Islands. The Australian government denied permission citing data privacy issues, but it also meant lesser access to the internet for the Solomon Islands, where citizens have limited access to the internet to begin with. We also discussed the huge environmental costs of transporting and laying submarine cables – especially in the absence of adequate laws to govern international waters, and lack of data to pass laws to regulate environmental implications of submarine cables.
1) Shared resource: The internet is a shared resource, like the seas. This impacts how it is governed in terms of its ownership and in order to fulfill its transformational potential to foster free flow of information and ideas throughout the world. For example, undersea cables have to emerge from the Red Sea and cross Egypt. What happens to these cables if they are crossing a war zone that is bombed? How does this impact people’s access and right to expression, when a shared resource like the internet, a globally distributed network, operates without a central governing authority?

2) Multistakeholder: The early internet was not imagined as a replica of the physical world. And so, its governance was imagined to be multistakeholder, and not multilateral - governments talking to governments - in the physical world. The multi-stakeholder model envisages many stakeholder contributing to Internet Governance: civil society, governments, private sector, academia, technical community. These stakeholders contribute to Internet Governance processes such as the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) at global and regional levels. However, there are power dynamics between these stakeholder groups. And in practice, over the years, the IGF has become more of a space led by civil society, not living upto the true meaning of multistakeholderism. On the other hand, processes like the Global Digital Compact (GDC) that seeks to “outline shared principles for an open, free and secure digital future for all”\(^2\), are gearing it more towards a model where governments talk to governments as the

GDC can serve as a framework for policymakers and governments to develop policies and digital governance mechanisms, foster cooperation among economies for developing global standards and norms for digital technologies.3

3) Fragmentation: Internet Governance is not one consolidated whole, but comprises multiple components and layers. The three main layers are:4

Physical and telecommunications infrastructures: The layer that most of us interact with, includes the hardware that forms the basic structure of the global net: routers, switches, servers and equipment for data transmission such as copper or fiber-optic cables.

Logic: This layer includes the technical norms and standards that are preconditions for the functioning of communication. Such as, the Internet Protocol (IP), web addresses, and top-level domains.

Content and Applications: Includes applications and software like the World Wide Web, Firefox, Chrome, etc. that allow us to access the internet. And anything we see or interact with on the internet – including text, sound, images, videos, multimedia content, virtual realities, and so on.

While gender and sexuality activists tend to engage more with the Content and Applications layer, there is scope to engage with other aspects of Internet Governance.

3 https://blog.apnic.net/2023/05/05/understanding-the-global-digital-compact/
The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is an American nonprofit responsible for coordinating the maintenance and procedures of namespaces and numerical spaces, ensuring the network’s stable and secure operation. ICANN assigns top-level domains that indicate the types and categories of websites. There are 1589 top-level domains. Through an activity, we reflected on the politics of parameters and standards for accepting or rejecting top-level domains:

Imagine you are ICANN, and 3 proposals have come to you for the following top-level domains: Dot Porn, Dot Queer, Dot Woman. You have to approve or reject these proposals. Discuss!

**Dot Porn:** The group thought from the perspective of applicants who are adult content creators looking to monetise their content. They had mixed responses on approval and rejection of the proposed domain name. They identified pros such as greater searchability and identifiability of content with sexual expression as well as merchandise like sex toys. Approving .porn as a top-level domain can also help shape policies around digital sexual expression. However, regulation often comes with state control over what is acceptable, whose bodies and expressions are allowed on the internet and whose aren’t. Dot porn can be meaningfully approved if adult content creators have decision-making powers. In reality, .xxx was launched in 2011, and .porn was approved as a top-level domain in 2014, and is dedicated for the use of the adult entertainment industry.

---

community. Subsequently, .adult was made available in 2015. Over 4,000 domains under .adult and .porn were registered within the first hour of availability.\footnote{\url{https://icannwiki.org/.porn}} However, there was backlash from groups such as the Christian group Morality in Media and Saudi Arabia’s Communications and Information Technology Commission.

**Dot Queer:** The group largely approved .queer, with some reservations. They recognised more representation for queer content through .queer, but possible surveillance and targeted attacks on queer expression as well. From an economic perspective, there can be positive changes to the market, with queer-focused content and products being more visible. However, this also comes with chances of .queer being co-opted and misrepresented by capitalistic ventures. The group also noted that co-opting and misrepresentation of queer realities are also done through .com, and left us with the question whether .queer can counter these. There is currently no .queer top-level domain, however, .gay was launched publicly in 2020. Top Level Design LLC became the contracted registry operator for .gay after a private auction between four applicants that included companies such as dotgay LLC, affiliated with the International Gay & Lesbian Travel Association and the National Gay & Lesbian Chamber of Commerce. There were objections from various parties such as Saudi Arabia’s Communications and Information Technology Commission that said it is contrary to their culture. The International Lesbian Gay Bisexual Trans and Intersex Association (ILGA) filed a community objection on the grounds that there weren’t appropriate protections for such top-level domains to safeguard the gay community against abuse and misuse.\footnote{\url{https://icannwiki.org/.gay}}

**Dot Woman:** The group largely approved .woman, especially since it is viable from an economic perspective. They looked at the immense possibilities for marketing campaigns that can use .woman. However, there were some reservations about .woman in that it is gender-essential. It can also be language-restrictive — what about those who don’t identify with the word ‘woman’ which is not a part of their language? The group also highlighted concerns with hegemonic practices such as a single organisation (ICANN) deciding what top-level domains can or cannot exist. Currently, .woman doesn’t exist as a top-level domain.

\footnote{\url{https://icannwiki.org/.porn}} \footnote{\url{https://icannwiki.org/.gay}}
Applications and Content

Country X’s government has banned TikTok and now there are talks of banning Google Search and launching the country’s own search engine. What are the implications for different stakeholders?

Participants discussed this scenario in three groups, through the lens of civil society, the business sector, and the technical community: whether they agree or disagree, what are their arguments for or against, and what other stakeholders they need to work with in this scenario.

**Civil society:** The group was against the ban, citing implications on right to information and freedom of expression – this kind of censorship can be used as a tool to bury search results that are anti-government. Launching a country’s own search engine also increases the state’s capacity to surveil civil society, its movements and actions. Even though the government is proposing to launch its own search engine, there are still possibilities of privatisation. Bans and censorship make it hard for citizens to be part of global discourses in the digital space. To advocate against this, the group suggested collaborating with other stakeholders, such as large and small businesses, the legal fraternity to look at global frameworks for Internet Governance, and the technical community to create alternatives to censorship and help appraise the implications of the proposed search engine.
Businesses: The group was largely against the ban. From the business sector’s perspective, they thought about challenges with Search Engine Optimisation (SEO), which could become more difficult if the state had its own search engine, since current SEOs wouldn’t function properly. Brand visibility would take a hit as a result, and the transition could be challenging even in terms of interface accessibility as the government might not be able to build accessible and convenient user experiences, given lack of expertise, infrastructure and resources. They also thought about possibilities for local technologists and developers to receive better incentives if the state launches its own search engine, and whether it can be a purely public good with appropriate safeguards. However, banning and censorship sets a precedent that isn't in favour of the business community. They would work with advocacy organisations, lobbyists and industry bodies against the government’s proposal to ban Google.

Technical community: This group opposed the ban with concerns around monopoly, more censorship and state control of digital spaces, which would reduce opportunities for the technical community to innovate. Google Search currently has several accessibility features, which the government might not be able to replicate in its own search engine. Search engines usually have language options. But who gets to decide what languages a state-run search engine will be available in? Technologists and developers could also face a threat of unemployment if a state-run search engine is the only one that is functional, along with increased surveillance of their innovation because of possible new regulations. The group also highlighted issues around censorship and right to information, eg., if abortion is illegal in Country X, it might be difficult for people to look for sexual and reproductive health information using a state-run search engine. The technical community needs to work with businesses to plan and develop alternatives, such as a proxy for Google.

All the arguments by the three groups pointed towards the need for multi-stakeholder advocacy.
My Internet Governance Journey

A conversation with Anja Kovacs

Anja Kovacs (independent researcher and consultant and former Director, Internet Democracy Project) joined us virtually for a conversation with Bishakha Datta (Programme Lead, Point of View) about her experience with internet governance processes and how civil society can participate, with a feminist intersectional lens.

Anja talked about how interventions from the UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression greatly expanded the space for civil society in the Global South to get involved in policy and governance debates at a global level. In the early 2010s, the Internet Democracy Project looked at freedom of expression and the internet in South Asia, and how these two areas intersect. They examined the constitutionality and rights implications of Section 66A of the Information Technology Act in India which placed restrictions on online speech, among a range of other topics. One of the main highlights of Internet Governance in India is that Section 66A was later held unconstitutional and struck down.

In 2015, 38 people from 15 countries participated in the Asian Regional Consultation on the WSIS+10 Review, which the Internet Democracy Project had taken the lead in organising. They collectively drafted and released a statement with key messages, based on discussions on development, human rights and Internet Governance. These key messages fed directly into the global WSIS+10 Review process and into governments’ negotiations in that context.

Anja shared concerns around Internet Governance processes becoming less and less multistakeholder in approach, which is making it harder to find entry points into critical conversations. She shared how we can introduce the Feminist Principles of the Internet into Internet Governance spaces; eg. countering the shrinking of space by talking about sexual expression online, even if it’s not from a policy lens; and engaging with entities like UN Women and the UNFPA to nuance conversations on tech-facilitated gender-based violence and how censorship as a response can backfire on marginalised communities. With the limited resources that civil society organisations have at their disposal, we need to think strategically about the demands we put forth in Internet Governance spaces so that these will not backfire on marginalised folx, collaborate with and learn from other stakeholders engaging with these processes where possible and relevant, put multistakeholderism on the agenda, and also think of ways to engage at a national level.

---

8 https://internetdemocracy.in/policy/pattaya-key-messages-on-the-wsis-10-review-voices-from-the-asia-pacific-region
The Feminist Principles of the Internet (FPIs) are a series of statements that offer a gender and sexual rights lens on critical internet-related rights. Drafted in 2014 at the first Imagine a Feminist Internet meeting in Malaysia that brought together 50 activists working in areas of sexual rights, women’s rights, violence against women, and internet rights, the statements provide a framework for feminist movements to articulate and explore issues related to technology. The principles were then brought to different workshops and events, and to the second Imagine a Feminist Internet meeting in July 2015, where a new group of 40 activists revised the first version. The new version was published online on feministinternet.org in 2016, where anyone can expand the FPIs by contributing resources or translating them. Currently there are 6 clusters of FPIs: Access, Movements, Economy, Expression, Embodiment, and Environment which is in draft form.

We explored the FPIs through a group activity: Participants were divided into four groups. Each group was assigned a persona. Groups were also given the FPIs in the form of cards. Each group went through these cards and discussed the FPIs that are the most important in the context of their persona, to take to the Internet Governance space. And how the FPIs they choose can be part of the Internet Governance framework in the interest of their persona.

* https://feministinternet.org/
Group 1: Reshma, ASHA worker from a low-income Dalit community

The group chose Access, Usage, and Information as the most important FPIs in the context of Reshma, since she is likely to have limited access to technology given her caste and class location, income, gender, geolocation, and age. Access to technology, especially a smartphone, is very important for Reshma as she is an ASHA worker. ASHA workers are often forced to buy or borrow smartphones for conducting surveys and other health work, which becomes challenging as most of them come from low-income communities. The barriers that ASHA workers face in accessing smartphones are also reflective of a broader digital gender divide in access to digital skills, digital information, and digital security knowledge.

Group 2: Saira, a journalist and a queer Muslim woman with a disability

Participants chose Access, Information, Consent, Embodiment, and Anonymity as key FPIs in Saira’s context. As a woman with a disability, Saira has the right to safe and uninhibited access to the internet. Most technologies and platforms are not accessible-by-design, which creates barriers for persons with disabilities to access critical information, community, and pleasure in digital spaces. As a journalist, access to information is important to Saira. She embodies multiple intersectional identities across online and offline spaces. And so, her experiences of inequalities in the digital space, such as violence, privacy, expression, and consent are also layered. As a queer person, Saira has the right to anonymity – many queer and trans persons find it more enabling to navigate the internet using anonymous identities and pseudonyms.

Group 3: Malati, a sex worker

When it comes to sex workers, intersectional factors such as caste, class, gender and occupation come into play. The group chose Anonymity, Consent, and Violence as the most critical FPIs for Malati. Many sex workers are now working across physical and digital spaces. And with this transition came newer issues around online gender-based violence, and consent and privacy violations. Building an ethics and politics of consent in digital spaces is critical in order to recognise sex workers’ agency in their ability to make informed decisions on what aspects of their public or private lives they want to share online, and in what aspects they want to be anonymous.

**Group 4: Priya, a young urban trans person**

Group 4 chose Embodiment, Information, and Expression as key FPIs for Priya. Online spaces are considered ‘disembodied’, however, queer and trans folx embody multiple identities and realities in these spaces. It’s important to recognise trans persons’ right to unrestricted gender expression — similar to the physical world, trans persons are expected to perform their gender in the binary in digital spaces. Trans experiences are diverse, however, they’re seen as a monolith, across online and offline spaces. It is essential to recognise trans persons’ right to information access and resources, especially related to healthcare, gender affirming care, mental health and rights information in the Indian context.
Governing AI

A conversation with Urvashi Aneja

Urvashi Aneja (Director, Digital Futures Lab) joined us for a virtual conversation with Bishakha Datta (Programme Lead, Point of View) on issues around governing AI and emerging technologies. Urvashi broke down the workings of tools like Chat GPT and how we understand artificial intelligence when these tools work on the basis of pattern detection and computational statistics, without any power of reasoning or abstraction. She spoke about the dangers around labour and environment, as well as some positive and beneficial use cases when it comes to AI. For example, computer vision technology helps persons with visual impairments navigate digital spaces. Chat GPT could help people with low literacy understand complex pieces of text.

The real issue is not whether AI is beneficial or not, but who gets to design it, and for what purpose. One of the biggest dangers is the concentration of power in a handful of companies, without any public accountability. Decisions made in Silicon Valley are shaping how markets function, how democracies function, how people are intimate with each other, how we understand love. However, when it comes to the Global South, there’s very little investment in figuring out whether these products are suited for these populations, whether they’re trustworthy, and so on. There’s also the problem of bias when tools are not representative of populations where they’re deployed. A cancer detection tool that was trained on data from North American populations didn’t yield accurate results when it was deployed in India. Developers often assert that these are decision-support tools, and not decision-making tools. However, when these tools are introduced in low resource regions, there’s a natural tendency to rely on these tools.
The labour rights implications of AI are significant, especially in Global South contexts. Content moderators who were working to build ChatGPT were paid less than a dollar an hour and were exposed to huge volumes of abusive content. India is being positioned as a hub for data labeling and annotation work, while workers are paid low wages. There’s a human, physical aspect to the building of these machines, which is often forgotten in conversations about AI.

The environmental costs and energy consumption in building and maintaining these machines is huge. It’s a form of environmental racism where the benefits are experienced by a few and the harms are experienced by many, especially in Global South countries.

Given these concerns, governing artificial intelligence seems like an abstract and difficult concept. It’s critical for all stakeholders to rethink how we adopt emerging technologies — not just in terms of what the technology can do but also what its implications are in terms of power, accountability and the sustainability of these trajectories that we’re on. However, there are a lot of regulatory tools currently in place, for example, Competition Laws that can help break up monopolistic control that a few players have over the market. And privacy regulations around data minimisation and purpose limitation. It’s important to center labour rights in conversations around AI and emerging technologies, as well as the environmental harms, which can force companies to pause and rethink innovation. There needs to be independent third party mechanisms for auditing these tools and accountability mechanisms that approach these issues from a public interest perspective.

A big milestone in the area of AI and emerging tech is how civil society interventions have made conversations around harms, bias, discrimination, privacy violations and rights mainstream. Civil society has held tech companies accountable, which has shaped discourses around AI safety, trust, and so on. It’s important to continue building these narratives. Big changes have happened globally with regards to resisting top-down technological systems, because of the bottom-up swell of civil society. Eg. the banning of facial recognition systems in many public spaces in the US, and conversations about the harms of Chat GPT that were initiated by tech workers who advocated for centering their labour rights in these discourses. Civil society plays a major role in defining these societal outcomes concerning AI.
Governing Data

Apar Gupta on the Digital Personal Data Protection Act

Apar Gupta (Advocate and former Director of Internet Freedom Foundation) talked about data governance as a key aspect of Internet Governance — how data is gathered, stored, processed and disposed of. We looked at data governance in the context of India, via the Digital Data Protection Act (DPDPA), which brings a newer set of implications in terms of increased state control over how data is governed.

We discussed the main stakeholders in data governance: data fiduciaries, i.e. entities who determine the purpose and means of processing personal data; data principals, i.e. individuals to whom personal data relates; and data processors, i.e. entities that hold and process personal data on behalf of a data controller. There are also adverse implications on people’s right to privacy because of blanket exemptions for government entities to access personal data. This can have a disproportionate impact on marginalised communities.

Participants also discussed how to enable a culture of ethics and consent as we collect personal data in our work with marginalised groups, such as queer and trans communities. For example, organisations working to provide shelter, education and employment to LGBTQIA+ folx who had to leave their biological homes because of anti-queer abuse, are required to collect beneficiary data such as name, phone number, etc. in order to receive funding to sustain their work. There are also complexities around collecting personal data related to adolescents especially when it relates to ‘taboo’ subjects such as sexual and reproductive health rights. An ethics of consent around data collection would mean providing information to communities and enabling them to check what data is being gathered, how it will be used and processed, whether it is modifiable and so on.
Feedback

Here’s what participants shared:

“As a gender scholar and someone who works in the spheres of gender and other sociological intersections, it’s the first time that I got an opportunity to learn about the technicalities of the online space and interact.”

“The way things were broken down was great. The key takeaway for me now is to engage more in Internet Governance spaces.”

“The internet is more than what we see. I learned that it has a complex backend and a heavy duty infrastructure that comes with its own challenges and implications. Being anti-government or anti-establishment might not be the best strategy at all times to make digital spaces safer. I also learned that more research is needed to support policy changes. There is a need to contribute actively to building a feminist internet by bringing in global south realities, languages, and perspectives.”

“I now have a better understanding of the fragmented nature of Internet Governance and the intersections of Internet Governance and gender/sexuality. Found the sessions by Anja Kovacs and Urvashi Aneja to be particularly enlightening.”

“I had heard about ICANN but did not know how these processes work, its history, etc. Had also read the feminist principles of the internet but the activity made it more fun and context specific. I particularly appreciate the diversity in participant selection.”

“As someone with some background in the regulation of the internet, I found the workshop to be a refreshing change from the discussions that otherwise happen in similar settings and workshops. It’s really important to bring activists and civil society organisations to these conversations, we need to be consulted and made aware of challenges/ issues/ debates around Internet Governance.”

“Easy presentation of work leaving out the jargon, complex concepts and intellectually stimulating academic stuff out of the door.”

“Meeting so many people from other cities and states instilled in me a new sense for the work we do.”

“I loved the way the workshop was curated. Secondly, the logistical problems (esp. Travel for attendees) were handled very well. Thirdly, I left as a more knowledgeable person.”
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Point of View is a non-profit founded in 1996. We empower women, girls, and gender and sexual minorities to shape and inhabit digital spaces.

Our work aims to enable people of marginalised genders and sexualities to access greater power, autonomy, and voice to inhabit and occupy digital spaces. We do this through building digital skills, capacities, understandings, and knowledge around digital rights, harassment, violence, security, and resistance. We are recognised as a pioneer, leader, and field-builder in looking at digital technologies through a feminist sex-positive lens. We are also recognised for our work on disability through the lens of gender, sexuality, and violence.