Global Internet Governance and Europe: A Regional International Organization Perspective

Nanette S. Levinson, Meryem Marzouki

Suggested citation: Nanette S. Levinson, Meryem Marzouki. Global Internet Governance and Europe: A Regional International Organization Perspective. *The 22nd International Conference of Europeanists (CES)*, Jul 2015, Paris, France. <hal-01211791>

Global Internet Governance and Europe: A Regional International Organization Perspective

Nanette S. Levinson (American University, School of International Service, Washington DC, USA, nlevins@american.edu)

Meryem Marzouki (CNRS & UPMC Sorbonne Universités, Paris, France, Meryem.Marzouki@lip6.fr)

Paper presented at the 22nd International Conference of Europeanists

Mini-Symposium on Europe by Design

Panel 2: Cyber Europe: Internet, Security and Citizens' Rights

Paris, France, July 8-10, 2015

Introduction

The past decade of Internet governance issues and opportunities has been tumultuous and transformation-filled. Much work has been done on nation-states, new institutions such as ICANN or the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), civil society or even the private sector. (See for example Brousseau et al. (2012), Cammaerts (2011), DeNardis (2009), Epstein (2013), Franklin (2013), Malcolm (2008), Mueller (2002, 2010), Pavan (2012)). Less work focuses on the roles of international organizations, including long-standing regional international organizations such as the Council of Europe (CoE) and their interactions with other key actors.

This paper builds on a relatively long term view of international organizations in the complex and uncertain Internet governance ecosystem, beginning with the United Nations World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS[1]) and its crafting of an institutional innovation, the Internet Governance Forum[2], convened for the first time in 2006 in Athens, Greece. Using case study data from our research project on international organizations involved in Internet governance, it reports and analyzes findings from the Council of

[1] All WSIS-related documents can be found at <http://www.itu.int/wsis>

[2] All IGF-related documents can be found at <http://www.intgovforum.org>

Europe (CoE), a regional international organization founded in 1949, now with a membership of 47 member states, including the 28 members of the European Union.

Particular attention is paid to the CoE role in the multistakeholder approach to Internet governance, highlighted in WSIS outcome documents, and especially to the trajectory of such roles and any accompanying tensions and possibilities. The paper tracks a non-linear trajectory from a regional international organization as a region-wide coordinating mechanism for nation-state members to a global stakeholder itself. In so doing, the paper provides data regarding initial outcomes of this trajectory with special reference to power and possibilities of regional international organizations in the decade ahead.

This paper focuses on a case study from the authors' multi-year study of international organizations and Internet governance in a time of rapid change, greater global media coverage, and ensuing challenges (the UN-mandated periodic re-evaluation of the IGF, the Snowden revelations, and the ICANN/IANA transition period to name a few). It uses multiple methods: Interviews with those individuals charged with Internet related policy functions constitute a major data gathering function; additionally, content analysis of documents and archival analysis amplifies and provides a foundation for interview findings; finally, observation and participant observation at key meetings adds to data gathering and data analysis.

What Conceptual Framework for Internet Governance?

To examine international organizations and, as is the case in this paper, a regionally rooted international organization in the context of Internet governance policy spaces, it is important to use a multidisciplinary approach. Concepts from political science, sociology, and communication can help elucidate the complex processes surrounding what we term the Internet governance ecosystem.

Ecosystem or Regime Complex?

We borrow 'ecosystem' from the natural sciences. Here the ecosystem refers to a pattern of interconnected organizations and other human and non human actors in their

environmental settings. This more holistic approach allows for tracking the creation, dissemination and utilization of novel policy ideas as they interact with various organizational cultures, structures, and values and the resultant outcomes (or lack thereof).

Some work considers Internet governance as a regime. Krasner (1985, p.2) defines a regime as "sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actors' expectations converge in a given area of international relations. The focus here traditionally has been on the nation state without much reference to other organizational types or to infrastructure.

Recent work (Orsini et al., 2013 and Orsini, 2013) calls for the study of regime complexes in the context of global governance and adds non-state actors. There are conflicting definitions of regime complexes with Raustilia and Victor (2004) describing a regime complex as an "array of partially overlapping and non hierarchical institutions governing a particular issue area" while Orsini et al. (2013, p. 29) provide a more nuanced definition. They argue that a regime complex is "a network of three or more international regimes that relate to a common subject matter; exhibit overlapping membership; and generate substantive, normative or operative interactions recognized as potentially problematic whether or not they are managed effectively;" they provide the example of the global food security regime that encompasses human rights, international trade and agriculture regimes. Further, they conclude (p. 31) that perceptions draw the boundaries of the complex and that they produce 'opportunities and obstacles' (p. 34) for governance outcomes. But these authors do not specifically define the 'nodes' in the networks constituting regime complexes. Nor do they focus on organizational infrastructure. They do, however, include the 'management of regime complexes' as an important variable. In this regard, they observe that international organizations are very skilled at such management challenges. (The work they survey stems mainly from the environmental, human rights, trade and energy arenas.)

Other scholars (Zelli and van Asselt, 2013) identify similar 'dense' qualities in global environmental governance arenas and argue that it is more powerful to focus on interinstitutional linkages; they prefer to use the term 'institutional complexes' rather than regime complexes.

This density and 'messiness' of interinstitutional linkages within environmental governance also applies to Internet governance. Moreover, institutions that may be involved in other domains especially those of the environment, health, trade and, increasingly, security or defense arenas also deal with portions of Internet governance-related issues. While the earlier-cited environmental governance researchers discuss their own domains, there is great potential in tracing idea and practice flow across domains as well as within interinstitutional policy spaces (Levinson, 2012a; Levinson and Cogburn, 2011).

'Regime', 'regime complexes' and 'institutional complexes' in the international relations field build on an earlier generation of research in the public administration field where the focus was the nation-state; and scholars argued for the importance of studying a 'policy space' (Lambright, 1967). Policy space is the 'turf' or main agency where a specific policy issue has its home in nation state governments. Thus, the policy space for U.S. Internet governance in its early days was transferred to the US Department of Commerce from the U.S. Department of Defense. The key elements in these early policy space approaches are the individual nation-state agency/organization and the issue area. Today's policy spaces are so much more complex and often contested, involving multiple agencies within nation states and crossing national and regional boundaries, with a host of disparate actors, organizations, and interests. Indeed, as we demonstrate here, international organizations and, in particular for this study, the CoE, are important actors (including behind the stage) in the Internet governance policy spaces.

In global Internet governance, there is not always a single set of norms and principles; nor are there always clearly demarcated 'homes' for complex, cross-cultural policy issues. The regime complexes literature provides an important advance in dealing with, for example, non-state actors influences on regime complexes such as those in global environmental governance and outlines ways to trace such influence of non-state actors on individual institutions. Nye (2014), uses the regime and regime complex theory to map "cyber governance" activities. While his identification and analysis of "the Regime Complex for Managing Global Cyber Activities" indeed considers non-state actors such as "civil rights organizations" and some loose alliances, it is still rooted and almost only based on normative regimes and their interactions, influences and outcomes on some pre-identified

issues that are mainly related to cyberspace and infrastructure security. This almost single attempt of using the regime complex theory in the context of Internet governance thus still fails, in our opinion, to capture the more complete and multidirectional examination of interactions/flows/influences among a set of organizations of like or unlike characteristics, including institutions and organizations -- and the changes involved over time. The use of an ecosystem approach as advocated here allows overcoming these limitations, even though it could carry some risks of loosing established conceptual consistency.

Ad Hoc Processes

Schubert and Gupta (2013) focus on comparing coordination mechanisms related to environmental governance within the United Nations system. They highlight the gap with regard to formal governance processes and demonstrate the rise of ad hoc processes to deal with the complex coordination challenges.

Just as in environmental governance, much recent research in the area of Internet governance examines the complex and often messy interactions of a range of different actors (including nation state governments, regional governments, international organizations, non-state actors, standards-setting bodies, new organizations and indeed an entire domain name industry (including ICANN) and even new institutions such as the Internet Governance Forum (created in 2006 as a main outcome of the WSIS) and the concomitant rise of the term, multistakeholderism (DeNardis and Raymond, 2013; DeNardis, 2014; Drake and Kaspar, 2014; Gasser et al., 2015; Radu et. al, 2014; Brousseau and Marzouki, 2012; Mansell, 2014; Mueller, 2010; Musiani et al., 2015).

Our research identifies the presence of these ad hoc processes (alongside of formal processes) just as they appear in the environmental governance arena. We use Gupta and Pahl-Wostl's (2013, 54) definition of governance: "the exercise of authority, by different social actors in a society, though the development and implementation of explicit and implicit substantive and procedural roles to manage resources for the social good…however, only a small part of the governance spectrum has the authority and legitimacy to make regulatory decisions". In the Internet governance ecosystem, institutions such as the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) cannot 'regulate'; rather, the IGF serves as a forum for

dialogue as do the more recently spawned national and regional IGFs around the world. In the case of the Internet governance ecosystem also, international organizations cannot 'regulate' per se. Their original conception and early studies (Barnett and Finnemore, 2005) saw them as coordinating agencies and their roles bounded by these coordinating functions, representing their member states.

Research on international organizations (but not focused on the Internet governance arena per se), documents an 'opening up' of international organizations to transnational actors such as civil society organizations. Tallberg and colleagues (2013), using a database of international organizations covering a twenty-five year time period, provide data that indicates both that international organizations are definitely opening up to civil society actors and that they have become "political opportunity structures" with varied opportunity patterns.

The Tallberg study provides an important foundation for our research; but it is unidirectional in nature, focusing on civil society and cataloguing their increasing links to international organizations. Using the findings of Schemeil (2013) that extend beyond openness of access (for civil society organizations) and that indicate the proactive nature of the international organizations he studied as they reshaped themselves over time (and even their environments), including interactively and pro-actively connecting with civil society organizations, the research reported on here focuses on one regional international organization, the Council of Europe (CoE). Our data traces how the Council of Europe worked strategically to put human rights (and European values) at the center of Internet governance policy debates and how it continues to work to make itself a key actor in its ecosystem.

Additionally, studies from the field of international communication and knowledge transfer and utilization highlight the flow of ideas (and related outcomes/impacts) across national, organizational, and even cultural boundaries. See, for example, Levinson (2012b) for an examination of knowledge transfer across complex, cross-cultural inter-organizational boundaries. Using these frames to identify and capture ideas from international organizations to civil society and other actors in the Internet governance ecosystem and

vice versa allows us to track whether or not a specific international organization is creating and disseminating ideas and how these ideas are being used (or not) and why.

Global Experimental Governance: A Promising Framework?

Finally, very recent research that stems from studying primarily global environmental and health governance issues provides useful conceptual frames for this work on Internet governance and international organizations. See Levinson (2015) for applications of the global experimental governance (GXG) approach as it applies to Internet governance and inter-organizational knowledge transfer. GXG thrives when there is a balance between too much and too little agreement among nation states and where the participation of civil society becomes "indispensable" (DeBurca et al., 2014, p. 484). GXG adds opportunities for civil society participation and posits the presence of five key elements (p. 478):

- Stakeholder deliberation (with "a broadly shared perception of a common problem") leading to
- Articulation of "a framework understanding with open-ended goals" and
- Delegation of implementation to 'lower level or contextually-situated actors who have knowledge of local conditions and considerable discretion to adapt the framework norms to these different contexts"
- Provision of "continuous feedback form local contexts >>>with outcomes subject to peer review"
- Reevaluation and revision based upon this feedback and "the shared purposes".

Indeed, DeBurca et al. (2014, p. 479) talk briefly (focusing on environmental governance) about when international organizations engage in global experimental governance. Here they underline occasions when IOs "adopt organizational forms that allow state and non-state actors to learn, continually and accountably." In the case of Internet governance, one can point to the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) —a new multistakeholder dialogue-type institution created in 2006 as a result of the United Nation's World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) and its Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG, 2005. (See Levinson and Marzouki, 2014b for a more detailed discussion of the creation of the IGF).

While the DeBurca et al. (2014) formulation does not treat Internet governance directly, their notion of GXG does apply (with some shading) to the Internet governance ecosystem we study and, in particular, to international organizations and other actors in Internet governance on which we focus. In particular, GXG highlights inter-institutional linkages, multi-level policy making, and novel inter-organizational learning that goes beyond nation-states and supranational entities. It is particularly useful in thinking about the IGF or even ICANN (the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

What GXG does not do, however, is what we illustrate here: the nuanced ways international organizations attempt to shape their environmental settings and even those multilevel processes addressed above to redefine their own missions and arenas, re-energize and continue to make relevant their own raison d'etre, utilize effectively a multilevel and multistakeholder setting to reinforce their own member state support, and craft relevant roles for themselves in often messy, politically complex and compelling issue areas. Additionally, often such issue areas do not have the complete consensus of an international organization's participating member states.

A European Way of Internet Governance: the CoE Case Study

In this paper, we focus on the Council of Europe, as the CoE provides a powerful example of the role of international organizations in Internet governance (IG) and of GXG and international organizations.

CoE and IG: An Overview

Similar to other international organizations that we are also studying (such as the OECD, the UNESCO, and others, as reported in Levinson and Marzouki, 2014a, 2014b, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c) although operating on a more regional level, the CoE's original purpose did not at all deal with Internet governance. (It was, after all, founded in 1949, much before the creation of the Internet). Its core mandate is human rights, democracy and the rule of law. It has been involved in Internet governance processes since WSIS, and has managed to become an inescapable actor of the IGF since then.

Viewing the 'public face' of the CoE – at least through its home page on the Internet[3] - provides one view of the role of Internet governance in its public portfolio. One has to look under the 'Rule of Law' link to find "Common Standards and Policies". There, tenth in the listing, is Internet Governance. Above it in ninth place is Freedom of Expression and Media. If one clicks on this IG link, it brings to a page[4] listing events facilitated by the CoE and linked to its human rights and rule of law missions. Additional events listed are consistent with GXG approaches. For example, the CoE hosted a conference in Austria in 2014 on ""Shaping the Digital Environment – Ensuring our Rights on the Internet" to promote multi-stakeholder engagement or in 2013 it hosted a conference on multistakeholder dialogue for net neutrality and human rights.

The Internet Governance web page lists "Adopted Standards", either binding instruments such as Conventions relating to the Internet; or non-binding ones such as Internet-related Recommendations; or even internal plan of actions such as its "Internet Governance Strategy 2012-2015". It also lists 6 Council of Europe Actions, that tightly link core CoE values and traditions to emerging Internet issues. The six listed are as follows: "Protecting the Internet's universality, integrity and openness", "Maximizing rights and freedoms for Internet users", "Advancing privacy and data protection", "Enhancing the rule of law and effective cooperation against cybercrime", "Maximizing the Internet's potential to promote democracy and cultural diversity" and "Protecting and empowering children and young people". Throughout, it takes a strong stance in favor of a multistakeholder approach.

From the Inside: The role of the CoE Secretariat

Behind and beyond the documentary findings such as the above, our data from interviews of key leaders indicate intricate and important knowledge transfer patterns within the secretariat itself, from secretariat to member states, and with external organizations, especially those of civil society. Interviewees portray a vivid picture of the secretariat promoting ideas. For example, the secretariat used a task force format to formulate a strategy for Internet governance that the member states then adopted. They shifted Internet governance work more to the human rights arena, a core mission of CoE. As an

[3] See <http://www.coe.int>

[4] See <http://www.coe.int/IG>

interviewee there observes, "*everyone today agrees that human rights is important* [in Internet governance processes]. *We just kept talking about it*". This is in contrast to the first IGF where "*everyone there looked at us as aliens*", when they talked about human rights.

Over time they worked with civil society organizations with regard to the human rights issues and disseminated them through the IGF. "*In 2008, we started a discussion regarding what should be our participatory architecture to help us focus on human rights… I have a strong feeling that IG is a priority now at the CoE*", although perhaps not with enough resources and not the entirety of the CoE vision. The interviewee goes on to say, highlighting the importance of a longitudinal and systems view, "*it's a variable geometry — many interlocutors become allies over time*". Our own empirical data collected from activities of four main IOs (OECD, UNESCO, CoE and ITU) at the IGF meetings from 2006 to 2014 fully confirm these declarations from our interviewees (Levinson and Marzouki, 2014b; 2015c).

The CoE is still pursuing this strategy in 2015. For instance, among the accepted workshops for the 2015 IGF is one that provides a qualitative example of the CoE's role in this new Internet governance ecosystem where international organizations no longer merely coordinate among member states. Workshop No. 68[5] has the title *Can Civil Society Impact Global Internet Governance?*; its organizers come from academia, civil society, the technical community, and the Council of Europe. The list of speakers also includes representatives from other international organizations (UNESCO and OECD) as well as government, ICANN and the private sector. The focus of this workshop is civil society participation in various Internet governance arenas. Here is yet another example of an international organization, the CoE, playing a facilitating/ catalyzing role and linked to civil society, not just nation state governments.

Within the CoE's Secretariat itself, we showed in previous work how, while the CoE has been active with regard to human rights in the information society since the early WSIS days in 2002-2003, a major turn happened after the WSIS in 2005, which, as we qualified it,

[5] See <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/workshop-proposals/list-of-published-workshop-proposals>. The full list of workshops is at : <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/workshop-proposals/list-of-published-workshop-proposals>

"put back on its feet the CoE approach of Internet governance, from a vision of Internet governance as mainly the governance of political affairs using the Internet to that of the governance of the Internet itself as integral part of the political affairs". This happened following a taking over by one Secretariat division (Media) over the previous one in charge (Political affairs). This internal "coup" is fully documented in (Levinson and Marzouki, 2014a).

Another element is the role of the secretariat vis-a-vis the member states. While interviewees from each IO studied emphasized that in the words of one "*we are the member states*" or as another said "*we can only do what the governments instruct us*", the secretariats in each clearly play a role in crafting ideas, first to be adopted by the member states and then disseminated externally, often with 'allies' or 'partners'. In other cases, secretariats disseminated ideas informally to civil society organizations, building idea support, and then going to their member states for formal adoption. An example here comes from UNESCO where the Secretariat designed a study and widespread consultation, the results of which will be brought to the member states in November 2015. At the CoE, the Diplo Foundation[6] inter alia played an important 'partnering' role in idea dissemination.

Our findings on the pivotal role of the Secretariat, in the CoE case but also in that of the other IOs we studied, are entirely in line with other analyses in the literature related to global governance addressing fields other than that of Internet governance. For example, Jinnah (2014) comes to the same conclusions on IOs' secretariats influence in the field of Environmental governance, through her thorough analysis of four cases studies. Schemeil (2012), when discussing the empowerment of IOs in the information field, identifies the same strategies that weak or jeopardized organizations may develop towards external partners or adversaries: mandate enlargement, coalition and controlled overlap, nesting and mutual recognition. The case of the Council of Europe strategizing to put human rights at the center of Internet governance debates and, at the same time, to make itself an inescapable actor in the field, fully supports this analysis.

[6] See <http://www.diplomacy.edu>

Channeling Core European Values in IG proceedings

The Dynamic Coalitions (DCs), an innovative network-like structure at the IGF demonstrate another avenue for IOs' secretariats to exchange ideas, test issues or policies in the making and start promoting them on a large and diverse scale before bringing them back home to undertake formal adoption process by their member states. These loose structures were established at the first IGF in Athens in 2006, and described as "informal, issue-specific groups comprising members of various stakeholder groups".[7] The DCs provide a platform or "political opportunity structure" for international organizations such as the CoE, or for "policy entrepreneurship" (Levinson and Marzouki, 2014b).

Although informal by definition, a dynamic coalition has to establish itself with an action plan and minimal coordination means (such as a mailing list), and show that its membership comes from at least three different stakeholder categories. It has to demonstrate the necessity of its creation, and is subject to registration with and approval by the IGF Secretariat. At each yearly IGF meeting, dynamic coalitions are given a specific time slot for a public meeting, and must provide a public report of this activityMany IOs are involved in dynamic coalitions, and see them as an important means of interaction with other stakeholders through the dissemination of their work and the exchange of ideas (Levinson and Marzouki, 2014b).

Indeed, the CoE has become a key player at the IGFs. A compelling example is how the CoE with its participation in the DC it helped to found, the Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights and Principles (DC-IRP), catalyzed the creation of an instrument ultimately adopted by the CoE member states. In 2008, this DC undertook the collaborative writing of a *Charter of Human Rights and Principles for the Internet*. Its basis was the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and its challenge was to adapt these principles to include the newly emergent digital environment and to translate the principles into practice. Franklin (2013, Chapter 5) provides a detailed account of this DC-IRP work. A first version of the Charter was launched at the 2010 IGF in Vilnius, at which time the DC-IRP started larger

[7] See dedicated page on IGF website at <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/dynamiccoalitions>

consultations on this Charter, collecting comments from various stakeholders inside and outside the IGF community.

In addition to its participation in the DC-IRP, the CoE organized a more formal meeting at its headquarters in Strasbourg in April 2011. Participating in this meeting were civil society representatives from the DC-IRP who were also active in the Charter development, and CoE secretariat members beyond the ones participating in the DC-IRP. The aim of the meeting was to examine whether the Charter could serve as a basis for the realization of an objective of the CoE at that time: devising a CoE instrument mainly intended for citizens as Internet users, in the same way as the European Union produced the "Air Passenger Rights Charter" displayed in all EU airports. Above all, the CoE objective was to compile means of redress and remedy that Internet users could use to have their rights reinstated in case of violation, in an easier, cheaper and more efficient manner than through going to court, while safeguarding this democratic right.

After this meeting, the CoE established and funded in July 2012 a new Expert Committee, the *Committee of Experts on Rights of Internet Users* (MSI-DUI[8]), composed of 7 representatives of member states and 6 independent experts (4 of them coming from the DC-IRP) working on equal footing. Note this example of interlocking directorates and implications for knowledge transfer (Mizruchi, 1996). According to its terms of reference, the MSI-DUI's purpose was to establish "*a compendium of existing human rights for Internet users, to help them understand and exercise their rights when, considering their rights and freedoms have been adversely affected, they communicate with and seek effective recourse from key Internet actors and government agencies*." Reports and outcomes of the MSI-DUI meetings explicitly mention the cooperation with DC-IRP and the fact that it used the CoE Charter as one of its stating points. After its 18 months of existence, the MSI-DUI came up in December 2013 with a draft Recommendation on a Guide to Human Rights of Internet users containing the Guide itself as its appendix, and accompanied by an explanatory report. Finally, on 16 April 2014 and as a conclusion to the CoE formal adoption process, CoE member states, adopted both documents. See *Recommendation CM/Rec(2014)6 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on a Guide to human rights for Internet users* and

[8] See MSI-DUI webpage at : <http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/media/MSI-DUI/default_en.asp>

its *Addendum*.[9] As a follow-up, the CoE has undertaken a process in view of the implementation of this Guide by its member states, and a specific communication action towards Internet users themselves[10].

These examples illustrate the role of one regionally focused international organization and the way in which it disseminated ideas core to its own values in the broader, multistakeholder IGF context, leading to member states ultimate adoption of a new instrument embodying its key principles as they relate to the Internet environment. It succeeded in placing 'human rights' at the center of global Internet governance discussions and, thus, also solidifying its own organizational form, identity, and relevance in the dynamic era of a global Internet. In Levinson and Marzouki (2014b, 2015c) we also document in detail using empirical data how the Council of Europe has been working in interaction with the other IOs we are studying, while remaining by far the most active in IGF proceedings since 2006.

Another example of the CoE at work in a more regional context is EuroDIG[11] (European Dialogue on Internet Governance), a vibrant pan-European discussion of key issues related to Internet governance. It is by its own definition: *"an open platform for informal and inclusive discussion and exchange on public policy issues related to Internet Governance between stakeholders from all over Europe. It was created in 2008 by a number of key stakeholders representing various European groups working in the field of Internet governance. EuroDIG is a network which is open to all European stakeholders who are interested in contributing to an open and interactive discussion on Internet governance issues*". The CoE played a key role in the founding of EuroDIG, with its first meeting in 2008 and its annual editions since then in different European venues. EuroDIG 2015 was held in early June in Sofia, Bulgaria, again with support from a number of organizations including the CoE.

[9] Available at : <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=2184807>

[10] See dédicated website at : <http://www.coe.int/en/web/internet-users-rights/guide>

[11] See <http://www.eurodig.org>

Conclusion

This case study highlights a number of themes relevant to Internet governance and, indeed, to global governance, as addressed by a European intergovernmental organization. It traces the role of a regionally focused international organization- the CoE- and its interactions with institutions at global, regional and nation-state levels. The CoE has moved from its early days as a linking pin institution centered on human rights and the rule of law in the European context to today's position as an important actor in the global Internet governance ecosystem with its own Internet governance strategy and a more catalytic position, especially with regard to knowledge transfer. As the below table shows, the CoE fits the GXG approach as identified in (DeBurca et al., 2014, p. 478):

Stakeholder Deliberation	MSH IGF Workshops; Conferences; IGF DCs
Framework Articulation	CoE Expert Panel; Framework for understanding IG (2012)
Implementation Delegation (adapting norms to local contexts)	Recognizing local contexts/cultures within the frame of human rights for the internet
Feedback from local contexts; Peer review	CoE direct stated link between its values/framework + MSH dialogue.
Re-evaluation/Revision from feedback	Formulation of new IG strategy 2015-
+ Novel inter-organizational learning	CoE working with cs groups plus member states, fostering knowledge transfer/disseminating HR +the Internet

Taking the idea of human rights and translating it into the tumultuous discussions surrounding human rights on and off the Internet has allowed this international organization to remain relevant and vibrant. While a Secretariat can play this role either passively or actively, the CoE case demonstrates the strategic, active roles of a secretariat in ensuring the relevance of their own institution in a dynamic, global context.

What is particularly fascinating is the way in which this IO through its Secretariat links to civil society organizations through myriad means including the holding of conferences, the

organizing of sessions at the IGF, the presence in interlocking directorates such as the DCs and EuroDIG, and the steadfast diffusion of the principles of human rights and the rule of law.

References

Barnett, M., and Finnemore, M. (2005). The Power of Liberal International Organizations. In *Power in global governance* (Eds. Barnett and Duvall). Cambridge University Press.

Brousseau, E., and Marzouki, M. (2012). Old Issues, New Framings, Uncertain Implications. in *Governance, Regulation and Powers on the Internet* (Eds. Brousseau, Marzouki, and Meadel)**.** Cambridge University Press. 368-397.

Brousseau, E., Marzouki, M. and Méadel, C. (2012) (Eds). *Governance, Regulation and Powers on the Internet***.** Cambridge University Press.

Cammaerts, B. (2011). Power Dynamics in Multi-stakeholder Policy Processes and Intra-civil Society Networking, in *The Handbook of Global Media and Communication Policy* (Eds. Mansell and Raboy). Wiley Blackwell.

De Búrca, G., R. O. Keohane and C. Sabel (2014) Global Experimentalist Governance. *British Journal of Political Science*. 44 (3), pp. 477-486.

DeNardis, L. (2009). *Protocol Politics: The Globalization of Internet Governance*. MIT Press.

DeNardis, L. (2014). *The Global War For Internet Governance*. Yale University Press.

DeNardis, L. and Raymond, M. (2013). Thinking Clearly About Multistakeholder Internet Governance. Paper presented at the 8th Annual GigaNet Symposium. Bali, Indonesia, October 21, 2013. Available online at: <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2354377>

Drake, W. J. & Kaspar, L. (2014). Institutionalizing the Clearing House Function, in *Internet Governance: The NETmundial Roadmap* (Eds. Drake & Monroe Price). USC Annenberg Press.

Epstein, D. (2013) The Making of Information Governance Institutions. *Journal of Information Technology* 28 (2): 137-149.

Franklin, M. I. (2013). *Digital Dilemmas: Power, Resistance, and the Internet*. Oxford University Press.

Gasser, U., Budish, R. and West, S. M. (2015). Multistakeholder as Governance Groups: Observations from Case Studies. *Berkman Center Research Publication* No. 2015-1. Available

online at: <https://cyber.law.harvard.edu/publications/2014/internet_governance>

Gupta, J. and Pahl-Wostl, C. (2013). Global Water Governance in the Context of Global and Multilevel Governance: Its Need, Form, and Challenges. *Ecology and Society* 18 (4): 53.

Jinnah, S. (2014). *Post-Treaty Politics. Secretariat Influence in Global Environmental Governance*. MIT Press.

Levinson, N. S. (2012a). Constructing Global Governance in an Internet Era: Culture, Co-Processes and Non-State Actors. Paper presented at the International Studies Association Annual Meeting.

Levinson, N.S. (2012b). Ecologies of Representation: Knowledge, Networks, & Innovation In Internet Governance. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting.

Levinson, N. S. (2015). Advances in Virtual Learning: From Cross-cultural Teams to Regional/Global MOOCS. Paper Prepared for the European Consortium for Political Research General Conference.

Levinson, N. S. and Cogburn, D. L.. (2011). Improvising Internet Governance: Emerging Trends In The Internet Governance Forum. Paper presented at the International Association for Media & Communication Research Annual Meeting, July 2011.

Levinson, N.S. and Marzouki. .M. (2014a). IOs and the Transforming Global Internet Policy Architectures. Paper presented at the 5th ECPR Standing Group on Regulatory Governance Biennial Conference. Barcelona, June 2014. Available online at: <http://reggov2014.ibei.org/bcn-14-papers/21-23.pdf>

Levinson, N.S. and Marzouki. .M. (2014b). Internet Governance Institutionalization: Tensions and Trajectories. Paper presented at the 23rd IPSA World Congress of Political Science. Montreal, July 2014. Available online at: <http://paperroom.ipsa.org/papers/paper_34455.pdf>

Levinson, N. S. and Marzouki, M., (2015a). Internet Governance Institutionalization: Process and Trajectories, in *Global Governance Facing Structural Changes: New Institutional Trajectories in the Internet Era* (Eds. Rioux and Fontaine-Skronski), Palgrave-MacMillan. Forthcoming.

Levinson, N. S. and Marzouki, M., (2015b). IOs and Global Internet Governance Interorganizational Architecture, in *The Turn to Infrastructure in Internet Governance* (Eds. Musiani, Cogburn, DeNardis and Levinson). Palgrave-MacMillan. Forthcoming.

Levinson, N. S. and Marzouki, M. (2015c). Straddling Hegemony and Resistance in Internet Governance: The Soft Power of International Organizations. Paper prepared for the IAMCR 2015 conference. Montreal, July 2015.

Malcolm, J. (2008). *Multistakeholder Governance and the Internet Governance Forum*. Terminus Press.

Mansell, Robin (2014) The governance of communication networks: reconsidering the research agenda. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics*, 10 (2). pp. 145-153.

Mizruchi, Mark S., What Do Interlocks Do? An Analysis, Critique, and Assessment of Research on Interlocking Directorates. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 1996, 22:271-298.

Mueller, M. (2002). *Ruling the Root: Internet Governance and the Taming of Cyberspace*. MIT Press

Mueller, M. (2010). *Networks and States: The Global Politics of Internet Governance.* MIT Press

Musiani, F., Cogburn, D., DeNardis, L., Levinson, N. S. (Eds.) (2015). *The Turn to Infrastructure in Internet Governance*. Palgrave-MacMillan. Forthcoming.

Nye, J. S. Jr. (2014). The Regime Complex for Managing Global Cyber Activities. Global *Commission on Internet Governance Paper Series*. No. 2014-1. Available online at: <https://www.cigionline.org/sites/default/files/gcig_paper_no1.pdf>

Orsini, A., Morin, J.-F. and Young, O. (2013). Regime Complexes: A Buzz, a Boom, or a Boost for Global Governance? *Global Governance* 19: 27–39.

Orsini, A. (2013). Institutional Fragmentation and the Influence of "Multi-forum" Non-state Actors: Navigating the Regime Complexes for Forestry and Genetic Resources. *Global Environmental Politics*, Vol. 13, no. 3, p. 34-55 (2013). Available online at: <http://hdl.handle.net/2078.3/146157>

Pavan, E. (2012). *Frames and Communication in the Governance of Global Communication : A Network Study of the Internet Governance Forum*. Lexington Books.

Radu, R., Chenou, J.-M., and Weber, R. H. (Eds) (2014). *The Evolution of Global Internet Governance: Principles and Policies*. Springer.

Raustiala, K. and Victor, D. G. (2004). The Regime Complex for Plant Genetic Resources. *International Organization* 55: 277-309.

Schemeil, Y. (2012). Global governance: evolution and innovation in international Relation. in *Governance, Regulation and Powers on the Internet* (Eds. Brousseau, Marzouki, and Meadel). Cambridge University Press. 186-208.

Schemeil, Y. (2013). Bringing International Organization In: Global Institutions as Adaptive Hybrids. *Organization Studies* 34(2): 219-252.

Schubert, S., and J. Gupta. 2013. Comparing global coordination mechanisms on energy, environment, and water. *Ecology and Society* **18**(2): 22. Available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-05440-180222>

Tallberg, J., Sommerer, T., Squatrito, T. and Jönsson, C. (2013). *The Opening Up of International Organizations: Transnational Access in Global Governance*. Cambridge University Press.

WGIG (2005). Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance. Available online at: <http://www.itu.int/wsis/docs2/pc3/off5.pdf >.

Zelli, F. and van Asselt, H. (2013). The Institutional Fragmentation of Global Environmental Governance: Causes, Consequences, and Responses. *Global Environmental Politics* 13:3, 1-13.