



Centro de Tecnología y Sociedad (CETYS)

Event Report: Internet Policy Formation in Latin America 23 - 24 April 2015 Buenos Aires¹

Index

Introduction	2
Workshop: “The role of academia in Internet governance debates”	4
24 April Seminar: Internet policy in Latin America: assessing borderless governance and jurisdictional concerns	8
Annex I April 23 workshop participants’ bios.....	14
Annex II – Participating centers at 23 April workshop: research agenda and main projects	15
Annex III – Video recording	17

¹ Report produced by Carolina Aguerre and Mora Matassi for the Internet Policy Observatory, CGCS, Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.

Introduction

Since 2006 the Center for Technology and Society (*Centro de Tecnología y Sociedad - CETYS*) at the *Universidad de San Andrés* in Buenos Aires has a tradition of organizing seminars and colloquia about different issues related with new technologies and the Internet. The CETYS' wide disciplinary approach and strong policy orientation attract policy-makers, researchers, activists and business people to its events. This particular event on *Internet Policy Formation in Latin America* was organized jointly with the Internet Policy Observatory at the Center for Global Communications Studies from the Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.

Drawing upon a paper by Carolina Aguerre and Hernan Galperin titled as the seminar, the purpose of this event was to address an emerging trend surrounding the increasing importance in national agendas around Internet policy and governance issues. These have become more visible after the Snowden revelations in 2013, but their shapes, objectives and impact on national, regional and global processes is still being consolidated. Until recently, Internet governance was a relatively obscure topic in most technology policy agendas in Latin America. Debates were limited to specialized government agencies, a few academics, and a handful of NGOs. Today Internet governance issues are discussed at the highest policy levels and are prominently covered by the mainstream media, while key events such as NETmundial (April 2014) were attended by high-level representatives from across the region, as well as engaging in the organization of global conferences about the issue. The rapid rise of Internet governance in the policy agendas of Latin American countries has raised several questions: What are the institutional building blocks for policy formation and implementation? Which stakeholders are being represented and how? To what extent are institutional models from other countries being replicated? How are these domestic debates articulating with global Internet policy discussions and its institutions (IGF, WSIS, ITU, ICANN, etc)? Are there mechanisms for policy coordination within the region? Have these

mechanisms been effective? How can they be improved in order to strengthen Latin American voices in global debates?

The paper which has addressed these questions triggered the organization of a two-day event which brought representatives from research centers in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Italy and the US.

The first day was designed as a closed workshop, centered in the question about the role of academia in Internet governance. The goal of the workshop was to reflect upon the current research agenda on Internet governance in Latin America, and to discuss the broader role that universities and research centers can play in both their developing policymaking capacity, as well as the consistency of these policies. There were two desirable outcomes of this meeting: the first to delineate a research agenda on Internet governance for Latin America and the second to outline specific collaboration mechanisms. (The workshop discussions will be further developed on page 4).

The second day was designed as an open one-day seminar on Internet Policy Formation in Latin America, for a wider audience comprising students, policymakers, the business sector and NGO's doing research and advocacy on the subject. The seminar was organized in the format of two keynote speeches from non-regional professors, Bill Dutton from Quello Center (MSU) and Juan Carlos de Martin from Nexa Center (Politecnico de Torino) and four panel sessions which specifically addressed the regional dimensions of the issues. (The seminar topics will be further developed on page 8).

One main takeaway of both these two sessions is that there is scope for developing more regional studies, such as the one addressed by the paper which triggered the seminar. This would improve informational foundations, as well as concepts and theories which are better suited to address the problems of Internet policy and governance, particularly within the specific context of Latin America, which is different both in political terms, socially and culturally from other less developed regions of the global south. There is little academic

production in the region that manages to achieve the levels of awareness and influence that help to reframe the current issues and problems around Internet governance globally.

Another outcome of the event is that the Internet governance field is becoming increasingly relevant as well as complex, both in terms of diversification of the issues at stake, as well as the proliferation of venues where it is being addressed. As governments, not only in Latin America, but in the developed and developing world realize the relevance and criticality of the Internet, there will be a greater need to understand national and regional processes.

As highlighted by the discussions on both days, academia is being challenged in this environment to produce evidence-based research, in a context where much of the data produced for research is owned by private corporations. Academia should continue to address fundamental principles of the original Internet architecture connected to the freedoms and rights, which are increasingly dependent and vulnerable by this technology. In addition, from a social sciences perspective academia should not shy away from addressing Internet governance issues with larger problems that are ever-present in the current context, such as the effects of these technologies on power; the empowerment of the citizenry; democracy and the Internet and the conditions of access to technology and human development.

Workshop: “The role of academia in Internet governance debates”

23 April, 9.30 – 5.30 pm

As mentioned before, on 23 April a workshop by invitation was organized to address two main objectives: to delineate a research agenda on Internet governance for Latin America and to outline specific collaboration mechanisms. The workshop was designed to be purposively open-ended and with a flexible agenda to accommodate changes as needed, following the interests of participants and the flow of the discussion.

The first part of the meeting was devoted to introductions and sharing the main research agendas and ongoing projects of the different centers / university departments / NGOs, including the remote participation from the IPO/CGCS. The list of participants in this

workshop with a short description of their profiles and research centers is provided at the end (Annex I). Two NGOs – APC and *Fundación Vía Libre* - were invited to attend to participate in the session since these have a tradition of evidence-based research for their respective advocacy work. (Annex II contains a brief description of each center/organization’s agenda as developed at the meeting).

The second part of the workshop conflated sessions two and three of the program, which used as a background reference for discussion the paper by Urs Gasser “Toward an Enhanced Role of Academia in the Debates About the Future of Internet Governance—From Vision To Practice” and that of the co-organizers of the workshop, Carolina Aguerre and Hernan Galperin (2015) “Internet Policy Formation in Latin America: Understanding the links between the national, the regional, and the global”. The guiding questions of these last two sessions were: *How can/should universities and research centers in Latin America contribute to Internet governance debates and policymaking? And What are the research priorities for Internet governance in Latin America?*

With respect to the role of academia in Internet governance debates, one of the questions that emerged from Gasser’s (2014) assertion was that academia “can and should be more than a stakeholder”, which led to an intense discussion around two inter-related issues: a) the concept of multistakeholderism in Internet Governance and whether it had lived up to its promises since WSIS; b) the visibility of the role of academia in these spaces and how it should work to be redefined, if the idea is to claim a distinct stakeholder status.

With respect to the first issue, there was consensus that multistakeholder governance was desirable since, at a basic level, it provides the opportunity to discuss issues on equal footing, although it should not be equated to a democracy. Multistakeholder governance should be the model to approach the Internet, but not without clearer objectives and by revisiting some of the original values that the Internet espoused originally: equality, openness, social justice. There was a discussion as to whether these values are / should be the same after three decades of a wide and global adoption of the Internet. Following de

Nardis' & Raymond's work on multistakeholder governance (2013)², the question of whether the current model is favouring more concentration or a wider distribution of participants was addressed in the discussion, with the unmistakable flavour in the tone of discussions by most of the regional participants that there is immense scope of improvement in this area.

On the second issue, the specific role of academia, it was agreed that it was the only stakeholder that could raise the really difficult questions with intellectual freedom - although it is not a neutral player. This freedom will allow for a greater deconstruction of prefabricated concepts, such as that of multistakeholderism itself. Academia has had traditionally two roles: to provide evidence for public policies and articulate future and potentials beyond existing realities. There is a role for academia in middle to longer-term proposals for Internet policy.

Some participants noted that academia should not be considered a "stakeholder", but rather an external critical observer that provides the conceptual tools to approach these issues. Other perspectives pointed to the fact that academia is also part of many stakeholder groups.

Both in Europe and Latin America, states have developed a late interest in the Internet which has in turn influenced the visibility of academic contribution to these debates; these have only just started in the LAC region. In addition, this lack of visibility from non-US academics is the fact that the concept of "regime" has become mainstream to frame the terms of debate, but maybe Latin American researchers should question the validity of this concept to think about the issues from the "Global South" and think of alternatives coming from other theoretical perspectives, including constructivism and post-colonialism.

It was noted that there is a trend to create global knowledge networks and *ad hoc* expertise for Internet governance that well transcended the UN sphere.

It was also noted that in Latin America there are blurred lines between academia and civil society in the Internet governance and policy space. One of the alleged reasons was that there is conflation of funding sources from international donors.

² Laura De Nardis and Mark Raymond (2013). Thinking clearly about multistakeholder Internet governance.

In addition, it was noted that disciplinary bias and fragmentation was still a legacy problem that obstructs a more interdisciplinary approach, which is essential to address Internet governance and policy issues. This concern was also shared in Europe. Researchers are still evaluated through a traditional prism which hinders the adoption of emerging issues, such as those related with Internet policy and governance.

The last session of the workshop was devoted to analysing proposals for collaborative work and funding opportunities. There was a discussion on whether to create new spaces, join the existing ones, or a combination of both.

Specific initiatives:

- Bill Dutton suggested a special issue of the Journal of Information, Communication and Society. We have to decide how to proceed with this idea.
- Another initiative was to target US and European journals where there is an already perceived interest in Latin American issues / and or in IG in particular to promote the visibility of regional scholars to the issue. Monroe's guidance would be appreciated in the elaboration of such a list.
- Increase inter-center collaboration. The experience of the Network of Centers (NOC) was highlighted as a growing initiative which is now maturing to jump to another level of research collaboration – other than a platform for dissemination and information sharing which is currently its main role. It should be noted that there were four NOC centers present at this meeting (CETYS, CTS, ITS and NEXA).
- The example of LASA, the Latin American Studies Association which is the most prominent scholarly and multidisciplinary conference on Internet governance should be considered as a space for a panel on regional perspectives on Internet governance.

Unfortunately there was no time to continue with the discussion on future collaboration projects and funding opportunities. We would have needed an extra hour or two but there was also fatigue from all participants after intense discussions within this reduced group.

24 April Seminar: Internet policy in Latin America: assessing borderless governance and jurisdictional concerns

Auditorium, 9:00 am-6:00 pm.

On April 24 there was a one-day seminar titled “Internet Policy Formation in Latin America”, for a wider audience comprising students, policymakers, the business sector and NGO’s doing research and advocacy on the subject³. The seminar was organized in the format of three panel sessions and two keynote speeches. The opening session was a short introduction by Hernan Galperin the Director of CETYS and Marcelo Leiras, Director of the Department of Social Science at UDESA. Hernan Galperin’s introduction highlighted that national Internet policy-making is a recent phenomenon. He developed the basic concerns of the research paper that gave origin to this event and the degree of congruence and isomorphism between these national initiatives at the regional and international level.

First panel session: National and Regional Internet Policy and Governance Initiatives: Regulatory and Institutional Dimensions

Moderator. Ariel Graizer (CABASE), President of the Argentine Internet Association.

Panelists: Carolina Aguerre (CETYS - UDESA); Eleonora Rabinovich (Google); Mario Viola (ITS RIO).

In addition to moderating, Eng. Graizer provided a perspective of the current scenario in Argentina with the implementation of the new law regulating Internet and ICTs “Argentina Digital”. Since the law is currently being implemented and there were members of the Argentine Communications Secretary and Congress advisors in the audience, he developed the current weaknesses of the law, centered in its ambiguous definitions. According to Mr Graizer, this new legislation could potentially freeze future investments and developments in the Argentine Internet infrastructure with its excessive zeal on the acquisition of licenses for “ICT services”.

³ The session was attended along the day by nearly 50 different participants and there were 80 registrations for the event. The event’s URL is available here in Spanish: <http://www.udesa.edu.ar/Unidades-Academicas/Centros/Centro-de-Tecnologia-y-Sociedad/eventos?eid=11532>

Carolina Aguerre was the first panellist and she developed the main arguments of the paper on Internet Policy formation co-authored with Professor Galperin and presented the key findings to the audience. How did IG find a way into the national and regional agendas in these countries? What were the different trajectories for the adoption of Internet policy mechanisms in Argentina, Costa Rica and Mexico against the backdrop of Brazil? How are these initiatives related with regional and international experiences? The presentation dwelled mainly on these questions and illustrated how these trajectories have been triggered by different circumstances, but there is a pattern whereby the international context has pushed these different national players to develop their own institutional mechanisms, based on their existing technical infrastructure development to connect with emerging policy issues.

Eleonora Rabinovich addressed the key issues for Google's agenda in terms of Internet governance in the region: to develop accountability and transparency around Internet policies in the region; to increase the participation of civil society and to promote the LACIGF as a regional space of discussion and enhancement of Internet policy. Ms Rabinovich stressed that Google was working on many fronts to promote more evidence on the impact of an open and free Internet for developing economies.

Mario Viola (ITS - Rio) developed the current framework of participation of the Marco Civil and the implementation of the bill in Brazil. While it is a multistakeholder effort, using ICTs and web platforms to collect input for the implementation, the recent alliance between President Dilma Rousseff and the Internet.org project of Facebook has put at stake one of the most important topics of the bill, since it touched upon Net Neutrality. Prof. Viola stressed that to sustain Internet freedom, the appropriate regulation was needed to ensure these rights, rather than no regulation. The final part of his presentation dissected the different rights contained in the current Marco Civil in the Brazilian context, and the issues at stake for their implementation. These rights are the following: right to access the Internet; freedom of speech; privacy; protection of personal data; as well as the following network functionalities: net neutrality and the stability, security and functionality of the network.

The discussion that arose with the audience interventions was centred in understanding multistakeholder processes at a national level, particularly considering the recent cases of Marco Civil and the Ley Argentina Digital, where the state has the traditional mechanisms to consolidate positions based on regulatory premises or top-down mechanisms and how to make this more compatible with other processes occurring at the regional and international level.

Keynote: Bill Dutton Quello Center, Michigan State University

“Myths and Realities of Internet Governance for Development: World Wide Choices that Will Shape the Future of a Global Internet”⁴

The presentation addressed the challenges of Internet growth for society, for policy-makers and for the overall ecology of choices that goes well beyond the scope of telecommunications regulation. Past decades narratives were centered on technical innovations and according to Prof. Dutton, the next decades’ narrative will increasingly focus on Internet policy, regulations and governance. Among the issues that give rise to the significance of Internet Governance, he highlighted the following issues as causes that are currently affecting it: the *overall significance* of the Internet for social, economic, cultural and political life. It has become so ubiquitous from other aspects that it has become an essential technology. The issue of the *digital divide* is still a very strong and powerful motive for engagement with these issues. What he labelled the “*Trust Bubble*”, particularly after the Snowden revelations is another line of work that addresses the problems surrounding the rise of cybersecurity and cyberdefense as increasingly hot-topics in the scene. The media have engaged in a widespread dissemination of what he labelled as “*Moral Panics*”, mainly derived from the misuse of social media for attacks, bullying and harassment which serve to vilify these platforms rather than attend to the social conditions that give rise to this kind of behaviour. The issue of those who consider to be ‘*Left Out*’ of Internet policy and governance, particularly at a global level was another line that Bill Dutton addressed which he considers to represent many of the opinions coming out of the workshop of April 23 with respect to the of visibility of Latin American academia, and the

⁴ Presentation available at: <http://www.slideshare.net/WHDutton/dutton-argentina2015>

overall regional representation in global fora. As a last issue he considered that *national policy and regulation* are increasingly become more prominent and this turn has also lead a greater consideration of global Internet governance and policy as a more important issue in the national and regional agendas.

In the last section of his keynote he explored the principles underlying each type of governance arrangements, both multistakeholder and multilateral. This gave rise to questions from the audience that focused on de-constructing multistakeholder processes vis-à-vis multilateral approaches and their suitability for the different kinds of issues.

Second panel session: Challenges for the Development of International and Regional Regimes: lessons for the Internet

Moderator: Carolina Aguerre (CETYS, UDESA).

Panelists: Dr. Daniel Blinder (*Universidad Nacional de San Martin*); Enrique Chaparro (Fundación Vía Libre); Marilia Maciel (CTS – FGV); Esteban Lescano (CRISP team - LACNIC).

Dr. Daniel Blinder provided reflections on the development of nuclear capabilities and satellite communications technology in Argentina in the last decades of the twentieth century. The development of international cooperation, as well as the increase of trust which is needed by the international system, when non-central powers develop these technologies, was used as a counterpoint to illustrate the differentiated unfolding of the so-called “dual” technologies. In many respects, the Internet could be increasingly considered a dual technology.

Enrique Chaparro’s intervention provided a critical perspective on the construction of the Internet governance regime and the concept of “ecosystem”. He considers that the role of the “technical community” as a stakeholder group is an inappropriate characterization, since there is a conflation of interests with the business sector. It is unclear to him what the technical community means these days in the global fora of Internet governance. In

addition, he questioned the increased reliance on centralized technologies – such as the DNS, as well as the lack of guarantees for privacy in the Internet.

Marilia Maciel's presentation supported the notion of deconstructing the concept of "regime" to understand Internet governance at a global level. She questioned the use of regime theory since it does not provide for enough material to think about change and improvement in the current global scenario. She also identified a bias in this theory that does not connect well with the interest of stakeholders coming from less developed countries. During the part of her intervention she developed the ideas surrounding Netmundial Initiative and how it integrates into other institutional blocks in the current scenario.

Esteban Lescano provided a case analysis of the CRISP team proposal for the IANA Stewardship Transition on behalf of the Internet numbers community. Mr Lescano deconstructed the proposal's main issues. But most importantly he dwelled on the process by which the different RIRs, which differ widely in terms of membership and economic resources in the five regions, managed to come through respecting both the process and deadline, but most importantly the different regional voices.

The questions that followed from the panel and the audience were centered on the resilience of the current Internet governance model: is it sufficiently open, legitimate and trustworthy? There was no consensus reached on any of these issues, but the panellists' different backgrounds and perspectives provided a more balanced view on how this "regime" and international Internet mechanisms are managing to deal with the different sets of problems at stake.

Keynote: Juan Carlos De Martin (Nexa Center for Internet and Society, Politecnico di Torino): "The role of the academia in Internet governance"

Prof. De Martin highlighted that Internet policy should start to rethink itself and eliminate the word "Internet", since it is increasingly present in more and more policy domains. He

underscored two of the most pressing challenges for the Internet in 2015: (i) the increasing control of online information by States (through surveillance, national security reasons; alleging protection of freedom of expressions and copyright issues); (ii) the reduction of the Internet to a free trade issue. According to Prod De Martin, in order to protect the free flow of (business) data, Internet policy is being reduced to minimal levels of social relevance. His diagnosis claims that the Internet as we know it is going to become a casualty since there are more initiatives all over the place to promote national regulations that might lead to its fragmentation.

Facing this scenario, he considers that academia has a very important role in “reclaiming” the Internet as we know it. Nevertheless, the challenges facing academics are twofold: a) traditional disciplinary knowledge; and b) the rhythm of academics are not able to keep up with the pace of developments in this field. There are also problems to access accurate data about these issues, as it becomes increasingly owned by private bodies. To bypass these issues he proposes to analyse these innovations through traditional concerns that emanate from the social sciences such as democracy, ethics, justice, power and equality. He proposed that academia should explore the implications (technical, social, economic, political) of each of the potential rights / principles that are today being threatened by the Internet.

In the last section of his presentation, he addressed different examples of how these initiatives that are attempting to “reclaim” the Internet: the Internet Bill of Rights; Marco Civil; The Council of Europe’s Initiative; Tim Berners-Lee “Online Magna Carta”; the French National Assembly and the Bill of Rights initiative in Italy (chamber of deputies), where he developed the connections between the work developed at NEXA center with the Italian Parliament in order to promote greater knowledge about these issues.

With these cases he addressed how policy-makers and academia can work together to provide a more positive future for the Internet. Finally, academia is the space where we can still imagine and attempt to shape the Internet we want in the future.

Panel session 3: The Internet: International vs National Jurisdictional Issues

Moderator: Pablo Palazzi (Law Department, UDESA)⁵.

Panelists: Eduardo Bertoni (CELE, Universidad de Palermo); Paula Vargas (UDESA) and Paula Jaramillo (Derechos Digitales).

This panel was composed by panellists with a legal background, so the discussion was centred on the inevitability of the increasing adoption of legal instruments, bounded by rules of territory, to address global issues emanating from the pervasive use of the Internet.

Eduardo Bertoni's presentation was centered in his recently published book on Internet defamation problems of jurisdiction and applicable law. In these cases the State emerges as the predominant stakeholder for enforcement, yet the multistakeholder component emerges at the (international) relational level, where states are not the only interested parties. Paula Vargas addressed the practical tensions underlying a technology that had historically resisted to national regulatory approaches, but which is increasingly faced with legitimate tensions and dilemmas posed by national governments and stakeholders that wish to address their concerns at local courts.

Annex I April 23 workshop participants' bios

(In alphabetical order)

Carolina Aguerre (CETYS, Universidad de San Andrés)

Researcher and professor at the Universidad de San Andrés. Policy director at LACTLD.
<http://www.udesa.edu.ar/Unidades-Academicas/Centros/Centro-de-Tecnologia-y-Sociedad/Organizacion/Quienes-Somos>

Eduardo Bertoni (CELE, U. de Palermo)

Director of CELE and researcher on freedom of expression, human rights and Internet policy.
<http://www.palermo.edu/cele/personal.html>

Enrique Chaparro (Fundación Vía Libre)

Director of Fundación Vía Libre <http://www.vialibre.org.ar/quienes-somos-y-nuestra-vision/> (Advocacy and research on privacy, freedom and expression and intellectual property issues).

⁵ Pablo also provided an overview of the “right to be forgotten” debate in the region since Paula Jaramillo from Derechos Digitales (Chile) had to depart earlier due to the volcano eruption and the flight changes.

Juan Carlos de Martin (Nexa Center, Politecnico di Torino)

Co-director and co-founder of Nexa Center. Founder of Creative Commons Italy.

<http://nexa.polito.it/people/jcdemartin>

Bill Dutton (Quello Center, Michigan State U.)

Quello Director and Professor at Michigan State. Founder of the OII.

<http://quello.msu.edu/people/>

Hernan Galperin (CETYS, UDESA).

Director at CETYS and Visiting Professor at the University of Southern California.

<http://www.udesa.edu.ar/Unidades-Academicas/Centros/Centro-de-Tecnologia-y-Sociedad/Organizacion/Quienes-Somos>

Marilia Maciel (CTS FGV)

Researcher and coordinator at CTS – FGV. Specialized in Internet governance and international relations.

<http://diretorio.fgv.br/corpo-docente/marilia-maciel>

Mora Matassi (UDESA)

Undergraduate student at the Universidad de San Andrés. Research assistant and tutor.

Mario Viola (ITS Río)

Researcher at ITS Rio. Specialized in privacy and personal data protection.

<http://www.itsrio.org/sobre-o-its/equipe/?lang=en>

Dafne Sabanes Plou (APC)

Regional (LAC) Coordinator of APCs Women's Rights Program.

<https://www.apc.org/en/about/programmes/womens-networking-support-programme-apc-wnsp> (Internet related projects and ICT4D)

Paula Vargas (UdeSA)

Lawyer, Internet consultant (Facebook) and researcher at the program of Law and Technology, UdeSA.

<http://www.udesa.edu.ar/Sobre-San-Andres/Cuerpo-Docente/Detalle-de-profesor?pid=823191>

Annex II – Participating centers at 23 April workshop: research agenda and main projects

- APC. The representative in Argentina of APC, Dafne Sabanes Plou is the leader of the women's rights program. The main projects in this area were EROTICs (a regional program

on women sexual rights and ICTs), a program on online violence against women and the development of the Gender Dynamic Coalition, as well as the support to the ICT4D and the evaluation of the MDGs. Program websites: <https://www.takebackthetech.net/es>; <http://erotics.apc.org/>

- CELE, Universidad de Palermo, Buenos Aires. It has two main research areas: freedom of express and Access to information as two essential rights in the information age. It promotes advocacy in line with these rights in the digital age, as well as courses and training. Website: <http://www.palermo.edu/cele/objetivos.html>

- CETYS, Universidad de San Andres. It currently has four research areas: ICT policy; Internet Governance; e-Government; Education in the Information Society that are mainly oriented at the development of working documents and publications. Website: <http://www.udesa.edu.ar/Unidades-Academicas/Centros/Centro-de-Tecnologia-y-Sociedad>

- CTS, FGV. Main research areas focus on the creative industries and intellectual property rights; open business models, particularly in the music industry; outreach and awareness of the Marco Civil and Information and personal data protection laws; digital archives and libraries; digital democracy. Website: <http://direitorio.fgv.br/cts>

- DTIC, Universidad de San Andres. It is a newly launched area on Internet and ICT law focusing on data protection and privacy; telecommunications regulation; legal aspects of Internet businesses; computer evidence. Website: <http://www.udesa.edu.ar/Unidades-Academicas/Centros/Home>

- Fundación Vía Libre. For this year they are looking at an assessment of Netmundial after one year of the statement of Sao Paulo. It has a focus on open source software; digital rights, particularly privacy as well as new approaches to intellectual property rights in the digital age. <http://www.vialibre.org.ar/>

- ITS-Rio. Research areas: privacy and personal data protection (several projects); implementation of Marco Civil in Brazil; Big Data applied to public policy; Zero-rating.

<http://itsrio.org/projetos/>

- Nexa Center. Main current projects highlighted by Juan Carlos De Martin: Neubot.org in partnership with M-Lab; Creative Commons Italia, Open Data. Website:

<http://nexa.polito.it/research>

- Quello Center, Michigan State University. Focused on the policy and regulations of communications in the digital age. Current projects The Fifth Estate and Network Neutrality Impact Study. Website: <http://quello.msu.edu/>

Annex III – Video recording

A video with comments from some international speakers and the local organizers is available here:

[https://drive.google.com/a/udesa.edu.ar/file/d/0B_NX5YKxIk2VUXBWSGZkYVJjUzA/vi
ew](https://drive.google.com/a/udesa.edu.ar/file/d/0B_NX5YKxIk2VUXBWSGZkYVJjUzA/vi
ew)