JUST NET COALITION

With: Our World Is Not For Sale and Focus On The Global South

EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IN A DIGITAL WORLD

AN INTER-MOVEMENTS DIALOGUE FOR A DIGITAL JUSTICE AGENDA

WORKSHOP REPORT
BANGKOK, THAILAND
25 – 27 MARCH, 2019

Table of Contents

ABOUT THE WORKSHOP

The workshop took place from 25th March to 27th March, 2019 in Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand. It was organised by the Just Net Coalition, Focus On The Global South, and Our World Is Not For Sale. The meeting sought to build a global network of actors who value equity and social justice, and who want to preserve and promote those values in a digital world. It brought together actors from around the world that work on digital rights, the digital economy, and in sectors like agriculture, trade, education, gender rights and labour that are now being affected by digitalisation.

The workshop note is here and a list of participants is here. Participant biographies are here.

DAY 1 – 25th MARCH, 2019

SESSION 1: INAUGURATION AND SHARING WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

Session 1 started with an inaugural address by **Professor Soraj Hongladarom** of Chulalongkorn University. Professor Hongladarom spoke about digital issues in Thailand, and how they find resonance with issues worldwide.

Edgardo Legaspi from 'Focus On The Global South' then welcomed all participants on behalf of the organisers, and spoke about the changing nature of geopolitics in the digital world, with digital power substantively determining political power.

Deborah James from 'Our World Is Not For Sale' explained the objectives of the workshop: to build a global coalition of progressive actors in both the digital sector and in other sectors or thematic areas affected by the digital.

She talked about how those working on free trade agreements and the WTO are now having to work on digital issues, and how every sector and area is being changed by the digital – including health, agriculture, and labour. What is needed to counter this concentration of digital power is pro-people, pro-South vision, and a plan to build the world of economic justice and equity that we want. We can only take on Big Tech with the full participation of people from everywhere. We must also think of those who are not in the room – gig workers, consumers, citizens whose democratic rights are being hacked away.

As long as corporations see the possibility to bend the rules, they will do so. Which is why now is the time for us to come up with an actionable, common, global digital justice agenda.

A presentation titled 'Digital Monopolies, Surveillance Capitalism and Challenges for Democracy' was then made by **Prabir Purkayastha** from Just Net Coalition. It explained how the world's largest companies by market capitalisation are now digital companies, and how the importance of intangible assets has risen through time.

Prabir also talked about how digital technology had enabled the fastest rise of monopolies in the world, and how the internet had been 'enclosed'. For example,

more than 70% of web traffic today goes to Google and Facebook. The sharp rise in Google and Facebook advertising revenues has coincided with a fall in advertising revenues for newspapers, both print and digital.

Social relations are being mined as data that is being used to create machine learning algorithms. The presentation raised questions about how we can fight for the commons and public spaces in this age. You can find it **here**.

SESSION 2: WHAT IS THE DIGITAL PROBLEM?

Session 2 was facilitated by **Nanjira Sambuli** from the World Wide Web Foundation and **Renata Avila** from Fundacion Cuidadano Inteligente. They asked participants to introduce themselves and answer the questions: What is the most important digital question? What digital issue would you *not* like to talk about?

Some of the digital questions and issues highlighted by participants as the most important ones were:

1. How we can confront global digital corporations by bringing about greater consciousness among organised civil society.
2. Understanding how automation intersects with political economy.
3. Ownership of digital intelligence about us.
4. How programmers and other technology workers can become movement leaders for equity and social justice?
5. The programming of humans through digital infrastructure.
6. Digital profiling of people, and the platformisation of industries.
7. The use of trade deals to force people and countries to sign away their rights and the new scramble for the Global South.

The topics participants said they would rather avoid were those of:

1. An undue focus just on bias and transparency in AI (because it obscures political economy)
2. The limiting framing of "digital rights", and of only cultural subversion as resistance (because this strategy accepts the current dominant system as a given and leaves the fundamentals unchanged)
3. Representation in the digital world (because we should be aiming for emancipation instead)
4. Overly technical discussions, like about blockchain (because the larger questions were about the social sphere mediated by digital technology)

SESSION 3: RESPONDING TO THE DIGITAL PROBLEM

Session 3 was facilitated by **Chat Garcia Ramilo** from Association for Progressive Communications and **Richard Hill** from Association for Proper Internet Governance. Participants first answered the question, "What is being done about the digital problem?"

The key threads that emerged from the answers to these questions are:

1. The Global South is constantly responding to challenges and frameworks set by the Global North, and is not setting the agenda. Governments' hands are being tied through trade agreements.
2. Discussions about inclusion in the digital world, particularly of women, often ignores structural issues. Do we want a share of a poisoned pie? At the same time, one cannot afford to be excluded.
3. Proposals like universal basic income also buttress current structures and are class preserving. How do we address the root cause of repeating patterns of exploitation?
4. We engage with international fora on internet and digital governance, but these are mostly ineffective and have been co-opted. The tech giants dominate international governance meetings about data and other digital issues.
5. Countries, especially in Africa, are being told that connecting to the grid is of foremost importance, and that structural considerations can wait.

To the question, "What needs to be done about the digital problem?", participants answered:

1. We must develop better and clearer ties between social justice, human rights, environmental sustainability and tech movements. .
2. We, as progressives, must self-critically analyse the language we use to talk about technology. Issues of technology and digital justice, especially around trade, need to be made more accessible to people. In particular, we need to de-mystify e-commerce.
3. Demands for regulation of the digital economy should be assessed carefully so that, as against their likely intent, they do not end up benefiting the largest global digital corporations.
4. We need to inter alia position the right to unionise and competition law as counter-strategies to rapidly developing 'enclosures' of the digital world.

5. We need to demand both temporary concessions, such as through resisting global digital trade agreements, and radical solutions, such as developing public digital infrastructure to rival the likes of Google and Facebook.

6. We need more sectoral research on how digital trade agreements will affect each sector like agriculture, education, health, etc.

7. We need to be actively building and promoting alternatives, for example, by working with Uber drivers to create a platform where data is owned by them. We also need to build capacity and support the development of the digital industrial policies in countries.

8. We need to bring back the battles about intellectual property and copyright firmly into the digital era. Education is inextricably linked to copyright policy.

A representational matrix of the answers to these two questions is **here**.

SESSION 4: CAPTURING DIGITAL POWER FOR THE PEOPLE

Session 4 began with a presentation by **Parminder Jeet Singh** from IT for Change. The presentation argued that traditional concepts and instruments may be inadequate to fight the changing nature of capitalism, and that progressives are still using these instruments. Digital power began with software power in the 1990s, and the advent of the internet that consolidated this power. Ironically, the internet was seen as a counter-power when it first emerged. New digital power comprises data power, software power and network power, and the platform is the key economic institution that entrenches this power.

Digital power means owning intelligence about people. There is a qualitative difference between mechanisation and intelligencification of the economy in this manner, where the top corporations now own the "brains" of different sectors. Those who own digital intelligence have power over those about whom such inteligence is, even if the latter avail of services that use this intelligence.

The presentation spoke of the inadequacy of responses tried so far, including liberal individualistic responses like the openness framework, individual data control (including data management services), market-based regulation, and those based on ethics but divorced from power concerns. Some responses have focused solely on the 'machine vs man' problem and not the human interests behind the machine.

We first need to delineate the areas which we do not want to datafy and digitalise at all. Then, we need to identify areas open to digitalisation, but where this digitalisation needs to be slowed down and managed better, in order to not too suddenly and extensively upturn livelihoods. Third, in other areas, we need to take control of digitalisation as it happens.

Then, a new progressive framework of communitizing digital resources was presented, with a two-pronged focus on both democratic control and economic appropriation. This would entail community software, community networks, community data and community AI. The presentation can be found here.

Discussions after the presentation were around the following points:

1. In the context of AI, there are people behind the machine, and people who pay those people. Strategies for dealing with both sets will be different. The former need to be unionised.

2. Digital power as a category needs to be refined. The existence of property and class need to be considered. The state is the only instrument available for redistribution, and its class character matters.

3. Localism can be a solution to many digital issues, but some of our problems can only be resolved transnationally.

4. There are inequalities and power dynamics within communities, and the idea of communitising data needs to grapple with these. The framing of the digital commonwealth captures similar ideas.

5. Even if digital resources are in principle communitized, appropriate principles, frameworks and means of their governance are required.

In **Part 2 of Session 4**, **Ansgar Koene** from the University of Nottinghamshire and **Arthur Gwagwa** from Global South Initiative facilitated an open discussion on formulating key ideas and points of departure for a progressive and Southern analysis of the 'digital', and frameworks of advocacy and action. Participants were divided into groups, and each group reported back on its discussions.

Group discussions included the following themes and insights:

1. Any progressive digital justice analysis must aim at shifting power to the people. We have to be clear that what we are against is digital monopolies, and not the internet or digital technology themselves.

2. Data can perhaps be thought of as a public good. Anything that doesn't put ownership of data and the digital space at the centre will potentially not be adequate.

3. Key principles to keep in mind are decentralisation, enabling collective action, accountability, and transparency. We first need to look at and fully understand the existing data phenomena, and then arrive at principles – taking pointers from climate change action.

4. We need to develop non-financial metrics to measure the digital outcomes we want to measure. Also, efficiency alone cannot be the reference point.

5. We can employ different ways to think about localism and communities. There is a localism of shared purpose, such as farmers' communities. There are multiple levels of communities that can control technology, depending on the purpose of action. Similarly, we can explore the idea of data rights specific to different sectors; for example, to have completely non-negotiable parameters on the sharing of children's data.

6. There was a recognition that local community-based governance can also become regressive and repressive. We must analyse classes within

communities. How will smaller communities talk to each other? Can they find common ground for collective action?

7. Technical solutions must be used as well. Data can be held in a way that it doesn't have to be globally shared but that can still provide global insights.

8. The problems with the state must also be kept in mind. We can explore the notion of trusteeship, where data is held neither by corporations nor by the government. The trust can be run in line with the specific purposes of data use.

9. An important question in progressive strategy is the role of international rules. Do we look at individual states for ensuring digital justice? Can we tax social media? We must seek tax justice. Global digital corporations avoid and evade taxes using tax havens and tax optimisation techniques.

10. We must think of MSMEs as potential beneficiaries of progressive policies. We can build a framework for empowerment of the informal sector and small players.

11. Progressive actors need to improve communication and simplify issues.

12. We have to examine if and how data is a form of labour. Data unions could be a way to conceptualise how people can come together to defend their data rights.

13. We can no longer organise using the same vocabulary we have been using. New, powerful, data related progressive language is needed. At the same time, the amorphous category of "power" is not helpful – the profit motive still reigns supreme.

14. Different models may be needed for fixing the distinct (but related) problems of automation leading to unemployment, and data extractivism leading to knowledge-based control. The capital-labour relationships work differently in the two cases.

DAY 2 – 26th MARCH, 2019

SESSION 5: HOW THE DIGITAL IMPACTS DIFFERENT SECTORS

Session 5 consisted of sectoral and thematic presentations on the impact of the digital. It started with presentations on **digitisation and gender** by **Gita Sen** from Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era (DAWN) and **Mariana Valente** from InternetLab.

Gita spoke about how we need to think of gender not as a sector but as an indispensable part of any policy, and one to be integrated from the beginning. Human reproduction is imbricated in gender relations, and in our current reality, we do not reproduce ourselves as human beings except through gender relations. Under capitalism, gender has been struggling at the margins because human reproduction itself has been relegated to the margins. This has led to tropes of victimisation of women emerging since the 1970s. We should replace this trope, because everyone is a victim under the current system. What happens to women because of the fractured relationship between production and reproduction is often a forewarning of what will happen overall. You can see that that might be the case in the digital justice conversation as well. Women may be the first to experience the negative impact of the system.

Feminists have been working on digital justice issues such as:

1. Macro-economics: Finance, trade and tax justice are all critically affected by what has happened between the third and fourth industrial revolution. They govern for us the larger scope of policy and regulation.

2. Livelihoods: Gender plays a critical role here, because it is the responsibility of women to take care of survival, not just biologically but on a day to day basis, so agriculture, fisheries, deep sea mining and the blue economy are all part of this and related to gender.

3. Labour: We should be concerned about what happens in factories, but also about informal and unpaid work, the bulk of which is women's responsiblity. When there are no resources to provide social protection, the tax on women through unpaid work becomes unbearable.

4. There equally exist critical connections between gender and education, health, etc.

We need to humanise the digital justice conversation. Humanising the digital justice debate is central to not be swept away in a sea of robots.

Mariana spoke about how in the 1990s, the internet provided a real opportunity. It has been allowing the formation of counter publics and has facilitated the flourishing of feminist discourse.

The current issues are many:

1. Social networks: there are issues about empowerment through activism and the oppositional interpretation of things. Non-consensual images and hate speech otherwise affect women disproportionately and affect women in politics and visible women even more. Facebook is full of mainly conservative discourse usually mocking feminists.

2. Sexism online: The separation of online and offline is flawed. Surveillance applies in particular forms to women at risk. One of the strategies to deal with sexism has been call out practices like #MeToo. Beyond this, we also need to measure women's participation online through time and activities undertaken.

3. Violence and visibility: Women walk a thin line on the internet. They are punished when they cross the invisible line. We must see the violence that is in the maintenance of social order, not just the breach of it.

4. Digital security discourse: Workshops for security could mean women have to protect themselves as if the problem was not the inequalities they face, but their own lack of effort.

5. Privacy: The private is public was a feminist call. Privacy was generally a value for men in that sense, and it now needs to be understood from a feminist lens.

Databases are often incomplete or inaccurate, like in the case of data on health or violence. Data is sometimes not broken down by gender, and is not contextualised. We need more theory to understand data, because without an understanding of the deep context, data can mislead us. Profiling and targeted advertising offer no escape. Machine learning learns from sexist patterns of behaviour in real life.

Discussions on this topic covered the following issues:

There is a pink-washing of agendas in trade, where e-commerce rules are shown to be desirable because they supposedly promote female entrepreneurship, when in reality they would be detrimental to the vast majority of women in the Global South.

The co-option of the feminist agenda is happening across sectors. 'He For She' is a campaign of placation, not of disruption.

A lot of digital work was done by women in the 1940s and 1950s. As an industry becomes digitalised, it becomes male dominated and then becomes highly paid. This is likely to happen also to, for instance, the garments industry as it is digitalising now.

Digitalisation is supposed to be labour saving, but this is not true in terms of public services. Public services are now just being relegated to the unpaid work of women, because social protection is being removed.

The actual people who create algorithms matter. If white, male cultures dominate in the creation of machine learning algorithms, the latter's sexism is unsurprising.

After this, **Elenita (Neth) Daño** from ETC Group and **Kartini Samon** from GRAIN made presentations on **digitisation and agriculture**.

Neth (presentation [here](#)) spoke about how the peasant food web feeds the world, and how there is growing concentration in agriculture today. In 2016, six companies controlled 60% of the global seed market and 75% of the global pesticides market. These were Syngenta, DuPont, Dow, Bayer, BASF SE, and Monsanto. Then, the three largest mega-mergers in agriculture took place. ChemChina acquired Syngenta, Dow and DuPont merged, and Bayer absorbed Monsanto. Today, the agricultural inputs market is controlled by these three and BASF SE. Thus the Big 6 have now changed into the Fat 4.

Concentration in ownership is growing not only in agrochemicals, seeds, fertilisers, and farm machinery, but also in agricultural commodity trading. The future in agriculture is data-driven. Companies focus on acquiring seed, soil, pests, micro-climate and other data. Now they have consolidated. Monsanto's acquisition of the micro-climate data company The Climate Corporation by was a turning point.

Digitalisation is fortifying the move towards vertical integration in agriculture. New enclosures are being created due to digitisation: The Fat 4, the commodity traders and farm machine manufacturers are all interconnected even more through digitisation.

The complete package of digitisation is about big data and is driven by who owns data and genomics. It no longer makes sense to examine one sector in the industry, because it is all being consolidated into one chain. The borders between seeds, chemicals, farm machinery and fertilizers are blurring. The impact of digitisation is going beyond food and agriculture, to society, culture, economy, the environment, politics and ethics.

There are interconnections between digital and data driven technology, automation and sensing, molecular engineering, and earth systems engineering and ecosystem interventions. The big farms don't need active human managers anymore.

Kartini (presentation [here](#)) spoke about digitalisation and challenges for food sovereignty. An OECD report on food, agriculture and fisheries says that the agricultural sector is both an important consumer and supplier of data. The collection and use of farm data is going hand in hand with global value chain integration. The FAO and EU see datafication as new developments that are full of promise.

The face of Asian food markets is changing rapidly, as over half of global food sales are now through supermarkets and hypermarkets. The traditional markets are closing down, and this is affecting women in particular adversely. All this is occurring while Asia has the fastest growing retail food sector in the world.

FDI in retail means unprecedented entry of foreign firms into countries where a large section of the population depends on agricultural earnings. This includes not just farmers but also everyone in the chain, like street vendors, small traders of fresh produce, etc.

Agriculture is now seeing the emergence of new retail. "New retail" is a term coined by Jack Ma to describe the merger of online and offline retail stores, announced as Alibaba's new company strategy. All this is connected to trade: Alibaba has direct supplies from New Zealand, and indulges in anti-competitive practices. It has put out a new competition call for AI solutions to detect food safety.

By far the biggest "new retail" deal has been the acquisition of Whole Foods by Amazon. It has threatened conventional retail companies like Walmart who are in turn aggressively seeking to merge with online retail companies.

The intertwining of grocery and online companies is also a test-bed to try out new technologies, such as unmanned greenhouse/farm, stores, or shaping consumers behaviour through the use of consumer data and analytics to optimize the vertical value-chain.

For example, unmanned vegetable factories and smart agriculture are now being explored. At the same time as new retail gets a red carpet welcome, traditional markets are being forcibly closed down, and there is a lot of resistance to this. Under precision farming and unmanned farms, few humans are required to produce food. Where do we expect people to go when these jobs disappear?

Discussions on this topic covered the following issues:

1. There is a perverse connection between industrialisation of food and health. There are adverse health effects and consumerism, and a whole new industry is created to deal with this.

2. Many IP laws are becoming superfluous because of databases on genetic sequences, which does not attribute to sources.

3. The change in agriculture that digitisation is bringing is not just a change in the supply chain. It is brutal and sophisticated end-to-end exploitation.

4. The business model of e-commerce needs to be understood better by agriculture activists. Are e-commerce companies selling milk, or are they selling platform and finance?

5. All rights and protections that exist for the offline world are not transferred online. Digital bio-piracy of farmers' datasets is a serious threat. In 10 years' time, we won't have any resources that are not locked up.

6. The environmental aspect of these changes is a crucial one to discuss. These new technologies are far from resource efficient? Crytocurrency, for example, notoriously over-consumes power. Rare earth minerals are mined indiscriminately for producing some new devices.

This was followed by presentations by **Anita Rampal**, formerly at Delhi University, and **Gurumurthy Kasinathan** from IT for Change, on **digitalisation and education**.

Anita spoke about the new militaristic ideas in education policy, with nations seeking to out-think and out-educate everyone else. The economy of knowledge works by segregating children and creating a dichotomy of skill versus knowledge. There are separate commissions on skill development and knowledge commission, as if the two don't intersect in reality. There are laws being pushed that would introduce vocational education in Grade 3. Mathematics is used as a filter to sort children: sometimes into those who are "talented" and those who are "committed".

This is due to neoliberalisation of education, one of the signs of which is India's decision to participate in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). The captive market that education offers is huge. The budget private schools market is a billion dollar industry. We need to reframe and craft new education; bring in artisanal knowledge.

With digitalisation, there is a use of deficit paradigms to sort children. Technology is misused here. It is necessary to understand the politics of intelligence and the imperial role of AI in education. The way to counter this is through Global South solidarity for alternative learning indicators. Perhaps we need to look at place based pedagogies. There are many frameworks to consider, like the Gandhian framework, Nayi Taleem, etc.

Gurumurthy spoke about how the neoliberal vision was one of factories without workers, farms without farmers, and schools without teachers. Education is facing huge pressure. The bureaucracy sees teachers as the problem, which ties in with technologies such as the use of CCTVs in classrooms, rules around how teachers must carry tablets with the location on, and so on. The system is setting up parents and teachers as adversaries.

Education is certainly a lucrative market. Encouragingly, there is some element of endogenous technological appropriation by schools and teachers. We must look at teachers as creators and at developing their collectives through digital networks. The bureaucracy, however, does not want to let teachers collectivise. The Government of India has a policy preferring free and open source technology in public education, which can enable local creativity.

Predictive models like those of IBM Watson are already being used in India. If these developments continue, Google, which has a huge amount of schools' data, will direct teachers on what to teach and how to teach. There will be a rise of personal analysis driven learning.

There are two major issues around digitalisation in education now:

1. The ownership of technology, platforms, and data: We should seek local ownership for technology and platforms. Should schools own the data generated in schools? India's NITI Aayog is encouraging IBM to collect student and school data. The problem is not just piracy, it is proprietizing otherwise locally available data. We always have to be conscious of where power resides, and to place technology in control of those whom it affects.

2. The role of digital intelligence: AI has the potential, for instance, to exacerbate the caste system, as it uses past patterns to predict the future. Remaining conscious of such pitfalls of digital technologies is important.

Discussions on this topic covered the following issues:

1. There are huge concerns about this brave new world of digitalised education, with how it deals with the humanities, history, philosophy, ethics and social injustice.

2. Educational conferences are funded heavily by large corporations where such agendas are pushed.

3. There have been attacks on the freedom of expression of teachers; and children at schools are being monitored, sometimes with facial recognition software. Such data is not protected. We need non-negotiables on the sharing and protection of children's data.

4. Data can now recognise patterns, providing correlations, without the intermediate step of theory and abstraction. Knowledge making both has a functional and a normative-human aspect. The functional aspect may partly be replaced by AI but the normative part cannot.

5. Humanities can bring in critical thinking to the creation of AI. Thus we need to create links between the two.

6. There is a large amount of funding from US organisations like the Gates Foundation. We must remain aware of biases and dependencies that are introduced through this and through international rankings.

After this, **Kate Lappin** from Public Services International and **Georgios Altintzis** from International Trade Union Confederation spoke on **digitalisation and labour**.

Kate started by speaking about how the data-intensive projects of smart cities are really about turning local governments into corporate controlled cities. 99 cities in India are moving in this direction. Enormous data capture is being undertaken with this venture. The cities are digitalised and, through this expedient, privatised.

The digitalisation of services, such as health services, is also a similar phenomenon. The collection of health data is leading to its privatisation to the benefit of the health industry.

Some governments are trying to resist such privatisation through the digital route. The city of Barcelona has sought to return such data to the public, by democratising its use. In Norway, the local government is looking at data as a public resource.

Georgios spoke about the extra-territoriality introduced by foreign e-commerce firms. There is no rule of labour law in this domain, and companies are registered in tax havens. Such lacunae already exist, but they will be amplified by the data economy.

In the post-market economy, updating laws can be futile. Work place surveillance is a big issue for trade unions around the world. The use of algorithms to determine workers' entitlements and rights means this process is opaque, and often workers or even governments are not able to access source codes to understand decision making.

Digitalisation has accentuated financialisation of the economy, thereby moving away from the real economy and real workers. Labour is losing its power to bargain.

Discussions on this topic covered the following issues:

1. We have a lot to learn from feminism, in terms of new theories of work and labour in the digital economy.

2. There are examples of workers being pitted against one another in this new economy. For example, traditional taxi driver unions have been violent against Uber drivers. This happens because the real enemy is absent and invisible.

3. We are now talking about extra territoriality, or a global assembly line of female workers, already ignored by unions for two decades. Public sector workers are

largely women. Women workers also work in MSMEs. We cannot do alternative digital organising unless we deal with unpaid work. The existence of gig work, and its current discontents, presents an opportunity to organise anew.

4. Informal contracts are relied upon to avoid regularisation and to prevent unionisation of workers.

5. The trade union movement has so far been unable to harvest anger at the new economy and direct it to the right place, whereas fascist movements have been successful at misdirecting this anger.

The next set of presentations were by **Renata Mielli** from National Forum of Democratization of Communication (FNDC) and **Sean O'Siochru** from Nexus, on **digitalisation, media and democracy**.

Renata (full notes [here](#)) spoke on the role of the media in the reproduction of political and economic power in modern societies. The media has always been part of structures of ideological domination. In the pre-internet era, information manipulation patterns were well known. What has changed with the internet?

With Web 2.0, a part of the social movement felt that we do not need to democratize communication anymore, because the internet has already done it for us. It was the end of the middlemen. But this situation brings us to the stage where everyone talks at the same time, no one listens. This is not really democratic, because we are not talking about an individual right, but a collective one. Besides, a new intermediary has emerged: private platforms – social networks and search engines. They select what should and should not be seen and read from a much more powerful input than opinion polls made in the past. They use our data in a totally opaque way. And in the midst of so much information, their selection is imperceptible.

The manipulation is no longer of masses, it is of individuals. This excess information leaves us incapable of discerning the real from the imaginary.

We have a problem of how to construct narratives in this new digital environment, but we do not have access to the same resources that the ultra-right uses. The new digital monopolies are sucking the internet into themselves, because of their business model based on attention, interaction and data collection, and they need to keep people for longer within their walls.

Right-wing sections that have used data and platforms to interfere in electoral results worldwide are raising the banner of free speech to defend their racist, sexist, homophobic, fascist speeches. The new fight against these platforms is not only against their monopoly character but also for content management and governance of algorithms. We need to requalify the debate and the concept of freedom of expression, the right to communication and democracy. But: who will arbitrate on this content? How can we prepare the justice system to have more agility and quality in the analysis of these issues?

Sean (presentation **here**) spoke about right to communicate. At the early stages of the internet, people felt it was going to be a sort of megaphone using which you could get your voice out. But they soon found that there were different barriers to the other areas of the right to communicate: to being heard (for instance, the barrier of language); to being understood (the barrier of education); or the inability to access information because of intellectual property rights.

Thus the right to communicate is not just the freedom to express, but also:

1. The right to be heard

2. The right to be understood

3. The right to learn, enhance and create

4. The right to respond and share

5. The right to seek and receive rights

6. The right to generate ideas and opinions

Which all loop back into the right to express and speak. The problem, therefore, is not one of freedom of expression, but of all these other rights.

They have developed a four-way framework of communication rights. This includes: communicating in the public sphere, communicating knowledge, civil rights in communication, and cultural rights in communication. It tries to cover all the potential barriers to enabling that cycle of communication to become a reality at the level of society. It is social from the outset, which radically differentiates it from the ideas of free speech. We need to look at social relations and collective rights.

Years ago, they had developed two poles for future possibilities – the first scenario is the dominant trade liberalisation paradigm. The second scenario is multilateral cooperation reborn. Between these two, considered quite extreme, they argued that there is a role for civil society. Looking back on this today, the dominant trade liberalisation paradigm at the time looks like the positive scenario rather than the negative one, and that indicates just how badly things have gone. On the positive side, the strategies proposed years ago to get to the second scenario still apply: rewriting trade rules, global development-oriented public media, support for local media, etc.

Discussions on this topic covered the following issues:

1. We need new perspectives on content regulation for new media, that take into account personal data protection without limiting free expression.

2. The rules of democracy are from a pre-digital era. Does democracy need to refresh itself for the digital age?

3. Modernism colonised the world, and locked it into a knowledge system from which the chances of escape seem bleak.

4. There has been a codification of demands of Big Tech through agreements like the TPP, which impact all communication rights.

SESSION 6: DIGITAL TRADE – THE NEOLIBERAL GLOBAL RULEBOOK FOR THE DIGITAL WORLD

Session 6 had a panel speaking about digital trade rules, and their impact, particularly on the Global South. This was followed by an open discussion. The panel included **Jane Kelsey** from the University of Auckland, **Burcu Kilic** from Public Citizen, **Munu Martin Luther** from Economic Policy Research Centre, and **Barkat Maruf** from COAST Trust.

Jane presented the big picture of digital trade. The development of international trade rules has always been a mechanism promoted by hegemonic powers that have been designed to facilitate and embed the particular mode of capitalism that was dominant at the time, to enable a maximisation of the benefits for them. We saw it with goods, then monopolies on IP, then on services, and now in the digital arena.

The fundamentals of the rules, as they are being developed, are to effectively create a regulation free zone for the digital arena. There is an externalisation of the US rulebook, where there was regulation on the telecommunication side, but a hands-off approach to the internet and the digital world. That means locking in benefits for first movers, who are the ones that dominate currently; to ensure that their oligopoly over the ecosystem, whether it is data, platforms, payments, marketplaces or algorithms, remains.

The USTR's office developed the Digital2Dozen principles, which was effectively codification of the demands of Big Tech. This codification, through TPP, got carried through TiSA, which failed. The same text is now found in a whole range of agreements. The creation of this template is strategic. There is a big push in the WTO to have these rules become global.

There are some objections raised to these digital trade rules:

1. The main objections raised by the South, and some CSO groups, unions, etc., is that this is not about trade. Trade is a Trojan horse that is being used to push rules designed to prevent the regulation of the power of dominant digital players.

2. It perpetuates development asymmetries, where the first movers lock up technology, source codes, etc. It disallows localisation, seeking of technology transfers or local presence, and so on.

However, there is optimism. There has been effective resistance. There is also resistance from the counter-hegemonic force, or the competing hegemony, of China. Our strategy has to be first to keep the space open, and second to develop alternative narratives and options that allow countries to say no.

Burcu (presentation here) spoke about international digital trade rules and their implications. Most issues relevant to the digital economy are part of the e-commerce chapter in various agreements. Most of the countries negotiating the TPP, that had such a chapter, simply did not know the implications of it.

Cross border data transfers are called free flow of information in Big Tech terminology. The provision first appeared in the Korea-US FTA in 2007, but it was not a hard commitment then. In the TPP, it was a much higher commitment. Big Tech had started to realise that countries were introducing regulations around data, including privacy. Any regulations introduced on data transfers, after such a provision, would have to pass this exception language, otherwise it becomes a non-tariff barrier. You have to pass a WTO test to qualify as legitimate exception, and this has not worked 44 out of the 45 times it was tried. Then these exact provisions were copied into the Singapore-Sri Lanka FTA. Singapore signed it without realising the implications, and now it cannot implement any privacy or data protection regulations that violate free flow of data. Some agreements have no exceptions whatsoever to free flow of data. This is what Big Tech wanted, and they seem to be getting it.

The other important provision is the one that disallows governments from examining source codes. In the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA), this also covers algorithms and prevents even judicial authorities from requiring their examination.

For three years, there have been very fierce discussions about e-commerce. In Jan 2019, 76 countries decided to go ahead towards making rules about e-commerce in the WTO. You can expect the same kind of provisions, as explained before, in the WTO as well. The TPP countries are the conveners of this process, and are pushing other

countries to adopt these provisions initially drafted by the US (which itself left the TPP).

Maruf spoke about the developments in digital trade as they related to Bangladesh. Digital trade today is just as undignified as captchas, where you, as a human being, prove your humanity to a robot. The Federal Reserve of Bangladesh was hacked by people outside Bangladesh, and a large amount of money was stolen. The Bank did not have the ability to protect itself against such an attack.

We need to understand the difference between the free flow of data and the free flow of information. These issues get mixed up with the issue of the Right to Information. ICT education provided by the government at the school level teaches about Microsoft, Adobe Photoshop, etc. There is nothing in this education about what AI is, how the political economy of digital trade works, etc.

These initiatives are often supply driven, and do not consider the demand on the ground. For example, IOM, an organisation with the mandate of migration, is implementing an e-commerce programme on a small island in Bangladesh. They are building the capacity of very small businessmen on the island, like betel leaf growers, to use e-commerce to eliminate the need for market intermediaries. But ultimately, they were trapped in the same cycle – they sold all their product to a foreign company that runs the e-commerce platform.

Bangladesh has a national e-commerce policy which is under review now. We felt it was driven by foreign companies. It wants the post office, a public institution, to serve these companies. The Digital Security Act, meant for protection against online sexual harassment, also curbed speech against the government. We have to focus on what the people's agenda on digital issues is, and not just respond to corporate agendas. The social sector will be severely affected by these developments.

Munu (presentation **here**) spoke about the global dynamics of digital trade, and what they mean for Africa. Digitalisation affects everything about us, especially under capitalism which is dominant in most countries in the world.

The discussion on trade agreements in Africa is now taking place under the Africa Continental Free Trade Area. It is trying to promote intra-Africa trade, as the continent has the least trade within itself. They expect to conclude e-commerce negotiations by

2021, and this is a matter of concern. Regional African agreements are also trying to include digital trade chapters.

For developing countries, industry and manufacturing are a key strategy for linking up agriculture and ultimately promoting development. Digitalisation fuels trade; it is a trade facilitation platform, but it largely impacts services in Africa. Most of these platforms are developed by external corporations, and a component of domestic trade is already going out as an impact of services. Industry's share of GDP in Africa has been declining, affecting the terms of trade. As we try to promote intra-African trade, we are still seeing an increase in imports in terms of services. There is an aggressive push for investments in Africa.

There is shrinking policy space for the development and implementation of digital industrialisation policies. We need some form of protectionism for African startups and MSMEs. We need domestic revenue generation. We need discrimination in public procurement. We need data localisation and technological transfer. A multilateral agreement on digital trade would make it almost impossible for such a digital industrialisation policy to be implemented.

We need to protect such policy space, address domestic challenges like infrastructure, the digital divide, and inadequate regulatory frameworks. We need to maintain consistency in our trade negotiating positions, especially with national-level investment policies. We need to push for a developmental state. A number of African countries are weak in front of the power of these corporations, and their only hope is to have a state that can push for these development policies.

Discussions in this session focused on:

1. Countries like the term e-commerce, but have they really done any impact assessment? Impact assessments should be carried out with relation to the broader economy, not just at a sectoral level.

2. E-commerce isn't just about the flow of goods and services, we are talking about possible breaches of personal information of individuals.

3. Global tech giants indulge in forum shopping. In addition to FTAs and the WTO, in June the G20 will be taking up digitalisation as an agenda in Japan. All international entities are peddling the same set of rules. There is also agreement-shopping: if the objectives are not met in the e-commerce chapter,

they are sought to be met with trade and services agreements. The digital agenda is redefined as services.

4. Issues like spam and cybersecurity that should have been handled by different UN agencies. The latter were blocked from handling them by the very same countries that are bringing these issues to the WTO.

5. Fundamentally e-commerce is not removed from industrialisation, value chains and global flows. There needs to be broader public awareness, particularly amongst small traders and trade unions on the impact of e-commerce, as they start becoming marginalised. Many developing countries are dominated by MSMEs. MSMEs are defined as so small in African countries that they cannot compete with even European MSMEs, let alone tech giants.

6. Even at the regional level, rules on e-commerce benefit different countries differently. Some countries like Kenya believe they have reached a level of development where these rules can benefit them. But other countries have concerns.

7. Different negotiators in the same developing country do not coordinate, and sometimes these countries end up agreeing to e-commerce rules in one FTA while rejecting them in another.

8. Countries conflate the potential gains from digital technologies with the framing of global trade rules. Signing on to such rules may actually exclude them from actively participating in the digital economy. We have to decode this rhetoric.

9. China has to date been focusing on more generally trade-related rules. Alibaba is not that concerned about data flows, local presence and source codes. China's defensive interests inside China are stronger than the offensive interests of Alibaba etc. We don't know for how long this will remain. But, China's Belt and Road Initiative has to be talked about in the context of digitalisation. China gets a free ride from African agreements.

10. These rules are really WTO 2.0. They are using e-commerce as a hook to get in all the liberalisation they have been wanting. So, it is best to avoid the e-commerce framing. It is also helpful, when reaching out to the public, to speak of the business model of tech giants. The issues of deregulation, non-payment

of taxes, access to markets, exploitation of cheap labour, and exploitation of data, then become much clearer.

11. We also need to closely examine NGO interventions, like those of IOM. Students need to be educated about the political ideas behind global digital trade.

SESSION 7: DEVELOPING COMMON DIGITAL AGENDAS

Session 7 was facilitated by **Duncan McCann** from New Economics Foundation and **Fabien Anthony** from Africa Youth Network. Participants agreed that the purpose of a common digital justice agenda should be to give us a common identity, highlight shared key issues, and frame them in an actionable manner. They then contributed their understanding of what the common digital justice agenda for the group should look like.

Some of the ideas that emerged from this session were:

1. It is critical that we name the problem. Data is the crux of the problem. We should be radical in our statements about data. We should ask for the prohibition of indiscriminate monetisation of data, and make clear our stance on who owns data. We should articulate clearly that in the new digital economy we are becoming the product.

2. We should demand the prohibition of targeted and personalised online advertising.

3. Although consent is great in theory, in practice it does not deliver what is expected because the time and effort required to ensure consent is disproportionate.

4. We must resist the prevailing toxic positivity of technology, but we ought to be positive in a different sense. We must make a claim on what is valuable. We should ensure that we highlight the many positive uses of data.

5. On the internet: we should show and highlight that another internet is possible. We should declare the internet a global public good, and highlight that we want an internet for the people and not for corporations.

6. We should reject the idea that digital is the solution to everything, and certainly not a solution to complex social problems. We can use three different ways to approach digitalisation in areas of concern. In some areas, we might not want any digitalisation. In some, we might want to slow down digitalisation. In others, we might want to proceed with digitalisation on our own terms.

7. We must articulate the new forms of labour that have emerged in the digital economy, that are often not recognised as such and are certainly not remunerated. We need democratic control over the entire digital space, not just over data. This would include our approach to gig work.

8. We ought to make clear that today multinationals can, and are, expropriating knowledge.

9. We should explore the ideas of decentralisation and decommodification in the digital economy.

DAY 3 – 27th MARCH, 2019

SESSION 8: BREAK-OUT GROUPS DISCUSS A FRAMEWORK FOR A COMMON DIGITAL JUSTICE AGENDA

Session 8 was facilitated by **Anita Gurumurthy** from IT for Change. Participants were divided into groups and asked to fill the following template:

> *We live in a world where...*
>
> *Therefore, to put digital power and resources in the hands of the people,...*

The different agendas that groups drafted are below.

Group 1

We live in a world where...

- Commodification of data (concentration and privatisation) leads to concentration of power within sectors. E.g. media concentration is becoming a huge problem for democracies

- Digitalisation is presented as *the* solution to many issues (infrastructures, labour, etc.)

- Neoliberal economic system fuels and entrenches such concentration

- Social, economic and political power is not controlled and regulated through democratic means

- There is erosion of local and national sovereignty

- There is unethical use and trade of data (both by states and multinational companies)

- Today's laws are not to regulate power, but to protect and promote power. I.e. laws control people, not companies

34

- An avoidable binary is shaping between criticising all digital vs. all digital is good

- Cross-sectoral digital developments are a threat to established industries, which are losing their position and power. So traditional enemies – the tradtional corporations -- could at times be our tactical friends. (Our enemy's enemy is our friend)

- Environmental degradation is aggravated by digital flip to consumption.

Therefore, to put digital power and resources in the hands of the people, we need…

- Local and global legislation (prohibit sector concentration)

- Education for good governance

- Promotion of local alternatives (against sector concentration)

- Digital power and sharing of data (at macro legislative levels)

- Data sovereignty and sharing of data (at micro implementation and project levels)

- Decentralise digital infrastructure and access as a public good

- Alliances across movements to come up with new solutions (to new problems).

Group 2

We live in a world where…

- There is a lot of marginalization of women

- Wealth and power are concentrated among a few entities who control and commodify the world's data

- Data is being collected, stored and used without regard our right to our own data. There are no rules in the digital world. Rule of law is replaced with the rule of the powerful

- There is a reduction of everything to digital data that erode our rights

- The infrastructure of digital domain/spaces is not public and transparent.

Therefore, to put digital power and resources in the hands of the people…

- No use of digital data should undermine or erode the rights framework, including new rights in the digital world

- Assert this vision/principle as the basis for ongoing global and national policy deliberations, i.e., Convention on Biological Diversity, Seed Treaty, etc.

- Development of digital technology should ensure the survival of the planet by preventing over extraction of resources

- Establishment of mechanisms for societal understanding and evaluation of the current and potential impacts of digitalization

- Stall trade agreements that reinforce the current corporate control of digital data and resources, and ensure that impacted peoples are heard in deliberations

- Proactively nurturing and building bridges with all critical social justice actors with digital/technology actors.

Group 3

We live in a world…

- Of a democratic crisis and a potentially irrelevant majority of people - where conservative ideas co-opt people's anxieties

- Where data is used to perpetuate inequalities, inside and between nations with creation of transnational monopolies

- Where data is socially generated and privately expropriated and AI has been envisaged only as extractivism; where the harvesting is done without informed consent of the producers

- Where physical extractivism has become invisible and data economy is causing environmental destruction, cultural erosion, with commodification of personal space

- Of digital solutionism – where digital is envisaged as solution for all social and technical problems.

Therefore, to put digital power and resources in the hands of the people…

- It must be understood that the rights to enjoy the results of the innovation is already a human right

- Production should take place in an emancipatory fashion, placing citizens before companies, sustainability before narrow profit and responsibility before tech-feasibility (precautionary principle)

- Digital ecosystem should be in the hands of the public, not privately owned

- The role of people's sovereignty has to become more pronounced with democratic oversight of data production, processing and use

- New forward-looking digital culture – a new futurism, big vision for the future

- Opportunity in times of crisis – take full advantage of the collapse of trust in liberal democracy and technology to radically shift the model

- Mainstreaming of AI production, outside the corporate sector, not for profit, but to help people

- Democratise technical innovation – socialise the data centres and the benefits of technologies, via incentives for those who contribute to public goods (tech coops)

- We need to politicise scientists and the AI process. We need to unionise the tech workers. Grey economy of technology, make visible invisible tech workers

- Deepen – radicalise – open access and free knowledge policies and mandates – focused on the we, the collectives. Thinking of "free" means thinking of "we" – expanding the commons in the digital world

- Demystify the narrative of entrepreneurship, visiblize that it is not freedom but exploitation and visiblize the left-outs of digitalisation

- Taxes should be applied to each layer of exploitation in the digital economy to achieve social appropriation of the tech advantages with local control of revenues.

Group 4

We live in a world…

- Of structures that are increasing corporate concentration leading to inequality

- Of injustice and increasing vulnerability of the poor

- Where people are sorted and left out to ensure power for the few

- Where global rules are made for the rich and powerful.

Therefore, to put digital power and resources in the hands of the people, we need to…

- Defeat global digital trade rules in their current state, & address neoliberalism at the national level: by enforcing existing rules, adapting existing rules to the digital economy; through equitable distribution; through collectivisation, including not just unions but citizen collectives

- Address market failures under the capitalist system, such as monopolies arising from externalities and network effects, and the unsustainability of the financialized system

- Develop alternative models of innovation, production and ownership at the local, regional and national level

- Reclaim data as a public good; while recognizing the notion of public as problematized and open to appropriation. Examples of methods are the cooperative approach, inclusion of interactive experts, localized approaches; all supported and/or financed by state resources

- Promote humanist approaches to education & knowledge

- Ensure that calls and commitments to ethics such as for/in AI cannot and should not replace fundamental human rights. They must enforce, uphold and defend them such rights

- Ensure that open standards & systems should not be (must no longer be) appropriated and monetized, and finally monopolized

- Renegotiate the use of language, terms such as the 'public' are used to homogenize, in their current form.

Group 5

We live in a world where…

- Data is a significant economic resource, where corporate power is controlling our lives, multiplying systemic and structural inequalities people face within and across countries, and often dismantling productive sectors

- Digitalization is used by corporations for capturing commons, evading paying taxes, and controlling governments. The line between governments and the private sector is blurred through systemic privatization of public services (health, education, water, energy, transport, tele-communications) Communication has turned from a right to a private service; profits come before rights

- 'Digital solutions' are provided as a panacea and pushed through trade rules shrinking the policy space of governments.

Therefore, to put digital power and resources in the hands of the people…

- Digital should serve humanity and be a tool for achieving development justice for people, planet, and for prosperity

- Digital should not be for pushing 'mere growth', but a tool for reducing socio-economic inequalities, ensuring redistribution

- Digital should be a public good and data should be owned and controlled by people for people

- Demand preservation of democratic governance over the digital space; opposing binding international trade agreements that restrict policy space and occupy the digital power of the people

- Adopt critical thinking on digital solutions; community ownership of data; communitize data resources and localize data governance

- Enhance inclusive, participatory, transparency democratic decision-making processes by decentralization about the digital spaces as a tool to ensure this

- Through common but differentiating responsibilities, turn communications into a commons

- Corporations must contribute to the fiscal base of the societies where their corporate activities take place through development of unitary taxation systems.

Group 6

We live in a world where...

- Technology has a potential for human emancipation. That potential is being stifled

- Digitalisation is leading to loss of agency. At the individual level, we are witnessing a commodification of people's identities and behaviour. Privacy is being compromised and surveillance is rampant. Misinformation and election rigging are disenfranchising the individual

- Producers are also losing agency. Robotic farms and the automation of factory labour are leading to social unrest. Everything is being platformised and is open to digital control by silicon valley

- Nations are also losing agency through loss of democratic, sovereign governance systems. We are moving towards counterfeit democracies; states are losing taxes and this is hurting public interest; sovereignty is lost to global corporate centres

- The ability to regulate the digital is being taken away permanently. Countries are being locked in at the international level, using forums like WTO

- Non- transparent and unaccountable systems are exacerbating existing inequalities

- There are implications for ecology and the environment, and all this is accentuating the issues of globalisation, leading to geo-political instability.

Therefore, to put digital power and resources in the hands of the people, we need…

- Some short term goals: stop e-commerce negotiations and shape alternative narratives

- Breaking up digital monopolies as an instrument to achieve our goal of democratising technology. Separate platform and content control

- To democratise and make digital infrastructure like the internet public

- Data governed in the public interest: some of data should be a public/common good, some community or producer owned, some self-governed or user-governed

- To create alternative platforms built on social justice

- Democratic regulation of AI in the public interest.

SESSION 9: WHAT SHOULD WE DO TOGETHER, AND HOW?

Session 9 was facilitated by **Beatriz Busaniche** from Fundacion Via Libre and **Cedric Leterme** from CETRI. Participants focused on 'process issues': how to work together as a group, how traditional movements and actors can interact with digital actors, their respective roles/responsibilities, collaboration platforms, standing working groups, advocacy and media strategies, and so on.

The following is a summary of the methods and actions identified in this session:

1. There should be a smaller group that will develop the digital justice manifesto, that can then be adopted by the larger group

2. There should be a communications task force within the group, to handle messaging and outreach

3. Likewise, there should be a financial task force to raise and manage resources for the group

4. We should produce 2 page long explainers on specific issues

5. We should organise and use workshops, webinars, databases, and translation tools.

SESSION 10: BREAK OUT GROUPS ON PROCESS

Session 10 was facilitated by **Bihter Moschini** from the Arab Network of NGOs for Development. Participants were divided into groups that discussed concrete ideas about process, taking off from the previous session. The main outcomes from each group are below.

Group 1

- Every group and network can share key forums/meetings that they feel will be useful for the coalition to connect to

- Member organisations may run a series of webinars, convening action to bring up to date about trade agreements and e-commerce

- Meetings to respond to the plurilateral e-commerce process at the WTO, and on digitalisation and labour movements

- Engagement with the Internet Governance Forum, WTO Public Forum and UNCTAD e-commerce week. Our engagement with forums should be beyond confrontation so that we are not always in "house is burning" mode. We need to be able to showcase that we are willing and able to be proactive – it is not only about saying the neoliberal vision is wrong. We should be able to show viable alternatives to the dominant digital trade agenda (for eg. internet and data as a public good)

- There need to be specific subcommittees of different people in the group, taking on specific strategic areas in detail (e.g., for data governance, Big Tech tracking, labour issues, developing alternative technologies and different models etc)

- The coordinating group should be able to ensure that issues are not just framed from the entry point of the digital and data, but are framed in a language that is accessible to these different constituencies.

Group 2

- A Universal Digital Justice Repository can be built. We can map actors, positions of governments and topics relevant to the struggle

- Assist collectively, locally, and universally to engage, to start with, at least two massive movements, for example, organised labour and women

- Create simple sectoral papers on the negative impact and potential harm of corporatising digitalisation and the alternatives

- Find allies among the businesses affected by e-commerce

- Areas of engagement can include: trade agreements, workers of global platforms, national legislations, IPRs, climate networks

- Means of engagement can include: exploring popular approaches to engage people, informing key actors, research, media strategies, engaging governments especially around their concerns

- Bring the notion of data to movements and develop bridges between traditional movements and digital activism. Dialogue across movements and identify other networks for multiplier effects

- Share case studies of negative experiences of different countries as digitalisation takes place in an unregulated manner.

Group 3

- The group needs an identity, organisational principles and narrative. It needs a positioning statement and organisational principles related to social justice and equality; we need to form a core which is committed to such a statement

- We need innovative communications methods. Identify urgent to-dos, prioritise and prepare an action plan

- We need regional formations and regional meetings based on common principles, such that we have local flavour and takes up localised debates

- We need to develop and maintain relationships between groups on digital actors and non-digital actors

- We need sector-based or thematic sub groups, and sectoral coordinators (two focal points) who can become an interface between the umbrella organisation and sectoral actors. It should be a standing arrangement and not a transitional arrangement. Likewise, we should have regional sub-groups

- Wherever there are existing networks, integration with them may be explored

- We need a deliberative approach for information sharing, and occasional writing

- Represent Just Net Coalition in international forums (like agricultural workers' forums or street vendors forums) for dissemination of JNC vision and networking. Identify other spaces for advocacy

- We should develop a mechanism for completion of our unfinished debates here.

Group 4

- We can achieve our goals through organizing and communication; outreach; a repository of policies; using alternative platforms; engaging in different languages; integrating existing resources

- We can host hackathons for producing tangible results

- Actionable data/information: we need a centralized database of who we are, other organizations, and activities happening, accessible to all members. We cannot be in clusters or avoid sharing of information for competition reasons. We need to share contacts for cooperation, reach the grassroots, get funding and do lobbying, develop calendars, and produce materials (especially entry/onboarding materials/toolkits, to help new organizations catching up)

- We need to develop frameworks/best practices on how to engage with big tech sector/government

- We should develop a communication strategy: how-tos, language to use, a social media practice (e.g.: 60 seconds videos). We need to reach the grassroots

- We should consider narrowing down to some subjects (data for example) which concern all of us

- We need a process for organizing from the local to the global for events (doing local organization, consultations, grassroots, and meeting again having undertaken such mobilisation).

Group 5

- We can organise different workshops on economics, technology and democratic governance, with regard to the digital arena in addition to sectoral workshops

- We can make a database of local actors, successful local and national initiatives and resources

- We should identify key messages for new communities and make broadcast tools. We should be conscious of accessibility and translation

- We should map existing platforms/discussion spaces/fora

- We should resist appropriation, and build bridges to allies who have the social capital to meaningfully resist the neoliberal onslaught

- We should engage with technologists, political parties and academics.

Group 6

- Continue to utilize remote engagement within the group (recognize inherent challenges and adopt measures to overcome). Use means to address inherent barriers for participation (acknowledge infrastructure limitations, consider linguistic barriers, time differences, invisible marginalization, etc.)

- Establish task forces across sectors/themes/regions. Coordinate the working of the task forces, and organize virtual engagements based on these themes and commitments

- Learning and cross-fertilization of ideas/experiences from across sectors and themes

- Teaching webinars: not one-off and not aiming at numbers, but follows a curriculum where participants commit to learn from and contribute to them. Another idea is a problem-cracking webinar where different sectors come together to identify problems and think out of the box

- Mapping out different channels of disseminating information in our regions/sectors for promoting the digital justice agenda

- Repository of best practices and policies (complemented by blog posts) along with their rationale. This will go a long way towards building a knowledge hub. Also build a repository of researches and resources generated from different partners/sectors

- Communicating our messages and positions to the world: increase the visibility of messages; simplify our messages and language. Communicate global issues by linking to local/personal experiences. For this, form a Communications Task Force.

SESSION 11: CHARTING THE WAY FORWARD

Session 11 was the closing session. It was facilitated by **Sally Burch** from Agencia Latinoamericana de Información (ALAI) and **Gurumurthy Kasinathan** from IT for Change. Concrete commitments were made by participants, ranging from communications, developing the digital justice manifesto, regional and sectoral networking, translation, sectoral expertise, collaborative research, technical support and raising finance. The participants decided that working groups will be developed accordingly.