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***1) Laws, policies and programmes that have been developed to address the impact of new technologies, including information and communications, technology on human rights in the context of assemblies, including peaceful protests.***

**OSCE ODIHR’s work on New Technologies and Assemblies:**

1. Freedom of peaceful assembly (FoPA) is a fundamental freedom that has been recognized as one of the foundations of a functioning democracy. OSCE participating States have committed to guaranteeing the right to freedom of assembly to every individual without discrimination (Copenhagen Document 1990, para (9.2) Paris 1990 Charter for a New Europe (preamble) and the Helsinki Statement from the OSCE Ministerial Meeting 2008). Within its mandate to support OSCE participating States in implementing their human dimension commitments, the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) has developed a range of tools to assist efforts of governments and civil society towards the full enjoyment of the freedom of peaceful assembly.
2. Together with the Council of Europe’s European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission), ODIHR issued *Guidelines on Freedom of Peaceful Assembly* (Guidelines).[[1]](#footnote-1) The Guidelines refer to relevant jurisprudence, particularly the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and of national constitutional courts and examples of good national legislation and state practices. The work on third edition of the Guidelines is ongoing and is planned to be issued by the end of 2019. The upcoming edition of the guidelines will address some of the issues and questions concerning new technologies and assemblies.
3. ODIHR also provides legal reviews of draft and existing legislation of OSCE participating States upon their request. The reviews are often published in co-operation with the Venice Commission of the Council of Europe,[[2]](#footnote-2) and supported by the ODIHR Panel of Experts on Freedom of Peaceful Assembly, officially established in 2006.[[3]](#footnote-3)
4. In line with its mandate to support participating States in the implementation of their commitments on freedom of peaceful assembly, ODIHR has been monitoring public assemblies across the OSCE space. Since 2011, ODIHR has monitored public assemblies in thirty OSCE participating States and published key findings and recommendations in regular thematic reports. Some of the findings refer to the manner in which new technologies are used to assist in the organisation of protest through the conduit of social media not only by the organisers but also by authorities.[[4]](#footnote-4)
5. Moreover, ODIHR has developed tools and offered training programmes for law enforcement officials on the human rights compliant policing of assemblies and, for civil society and OSCE field operations, on the monitoring of public assemblies.[[5]](#footnote-5) Already in 2011, the Handbook on Monitoring Assemblies (currently under revision) recognised the importance of social media stating that; *"* ***Monitoring social media:*** *It is useful to continue to monitor social networks and other forms of media in the aftermath of an assembly, to gauge people’s responses to the event and also to keep track of any follow-up activities by state bodies or other organizations.*”[[6]](#footnote-6)

***2) Effective uses of such technologies as enablers of the exercise of human rights, including peaceful protests.***

1. The Internet and social media have greatly facilitated the exercise of fundamental rights, including that of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly by stressing the right to freedom of expression, which is inextricably linked with freedom of peaceful assembly. The Internet and social media can be used to discuss, prepare, organize and publicize assemblies, as well as to jointly exercise this right.
2. Internet-based technologies play an increasingly instrumental part in the exercise of the right to FoPA and it is hard to imagine an assembly that does not involve some form of reliance on the Internet.[[7]](#footnote-7) In many areas, the Internet is accessible, cheap, fast, and borderless and has reduced the cost of communicating with others.[[8]](#footnote-8) However, the so-called ‘digital divide’ continues to exist and States are under increasing obligations to reduce it, given the importance of the Internet to everyday life[[9]](#footnote-9) and to political participation in particular.
3. The role social media in mobilisation of assemblies is increasingly pivotal to the exercise of the right to assemble. In particular, this raises the issue of the ease of organising assemblies horizontally without the need for formal organisations or organisers; and which in turn makes it easier to mobilise on short notice and without formal notification. Social media is also increasingly used during an assembly via forms of visual recording or live streaming of and from assemblies.
4. Additionally, there is increased evidence of not only organisers but also authorities using social media to co-ordinate efforts, and exchange information between authorities and organisers, in particular during large scale assemblies, such as the example already referred to above in footnote 4, (Québec G7 summit).
5. The planning and publicizing of an assembly are integral parts of the exercise of the rights to freedom of speech and assembly and should be facilitated and protected accordingly. Given the presumption in favour of peaceful assembly, organizers have the right to publicize the holding of an assembly ahead of time, both on and offline.[[10]](#footnote-10) Because of their importance in people’s everyday lives,[[11]](#footnote-11) the Internet and social media are often used to discuss, prepare, organize and publicize assemblies.[[12]](#footnote-12) Legal requirements to notify of an assembly should not impede activities remain entirely online or the planning process of assemblies taking place offline.

***3) The human rights challenges posed by interferences with the availability and use of such technologies in the context of assemblies, including peaceful protests (e.g. through network disruptions, blocking of internet services or restrictions on secure and confidential information.***

1. First and foremost, it should be re-emphasized that with reference to freedom of assembly States are *“under a stronger obligation to ensure the right with positive measures”* precisely as a result of the democratic function of the right, which is in literature, jurisprudence and practice, and indisputable fact.[[13]](#footnote-13) Indeed the Human Rights Committee (HRC) in its case law, has emphasized that “*When a State party imposes restrictions with the aim of reconciling an individual’s right to assembly and the aforementioned interests of general concern, it should be guided by the objective* ***of facilitating the right****, rather than seeking unnecessary or disproportionate limitations to it.”*[[14]](#footnote-14) Importantly, General Comment 31 [80][[15]](#footnote-15) states that the obligations of the State extend not only to the operation of its agents, but also in offering protection against acts committed by private agents and private parties. In the case of “online assemblies”, collective online actions of individuals, this may include privately-owned Internet platforms and social media networks.
2. Following this interpretation of the right under international law, it can be said that since a plethora of documents have recognised that people have “the same rights online as offline”, States shall facilitate the exercise of the right also through online means, and through providing, among others, access to the Internet, which has been recognised as essential to everyday life, and according to the European Court of Human Right – “increasingly recognized as a right”.[[16]](#footnote-16) Therefore, legislation and State policies should ensure that the Internet and social media can be used to prepare, mobilize and organize assemblies,[[17]](#footnote-17) which later take place in the street or another chosen location.
3. Indeed, States should at the very least not interfere with the new technologies used to exercise fundamental rights, through closing down access to the Internet and blocking sites. An Internet shutdown, (already practiced by States[[18]](#footnote-18)), whether whole or partial (for example, filtering) could be considered as a blanket ban, not only with respect to the right to freedom expression but on the right to freedom of assembly (including “online gatherings”) - which would not meet the demands of the permissible limitations set out in Article 19 and Article 21 of the ICCPR. It has been said in the context of the freedom of expression[[19]](#footnote-19) and would thus, equally apply to the freedom of assembly[[20]](#footnote-20) that “*Filtering of content on the Internet, using communications ‘kill switches’ (i.e. shutting down entire parts of communications systems) and the physical takeover of broadcasting stations are measures which can never be justified under human rights law”* .[[21]](#footnote-21)
4. Owing to the above, States should also bear in mind that the more general the ban (shutdown, filtering), the less likely it is to really respond to a pressing social need[[22]](#footnote-22) for it to be introduced, even for the purposes of national security. It is considered that such a drastic measure would only be available to States under the extremely limited circumstances permitted based on official derogation, and here, the livelihood of the entire country (as opposed to one political group in power) would have to be at stake. States should therefore, ensure that Internet access is maintained at all times, including during times of political unrest.[[23]](#footnote-23)
5. Furthermore, the question posed requires consideration of the role of Internet Service Providers (ISP),[[24]](#footnote-24) which can be described as follows:

States have the ultimate obligation to protect human rights, the obligations to respect, protect and fulfil, extend also to acts committed by third parties,[[25]](#footnote-25) which in this case also means, ISPs,[[26]](#footnote-26) which, while privately owned companies, host the publicly available space for expression and assembly.

1. States should therefore ensure that self-regulation by ISPs does not lead to a censorship of content, which would not ordinarily be permissible and acceptable in a democratic society. This also applies to assemblies expressing views that may ‘offend, shock or disturb’ the State or any sector of the population[[27]](#footnote-27) for as long as they do not incite violence.[[28]](#footnote-28) As well as ensure that these ISPs do not interfere with the message sought to be conveyed by the expression and/or assembly, through catch-all algorithms or unwarranted take down of content. On the other hand, ISPs may, in some jurisdictions, be held accountable when they do not react to or remove content or expression, which amounts to an incitement to violence or hate speech.[[29]](#footnote-29) States’ authorities regularly request information on the online activity of persons and groups from social media platforms, for example, Facebook received 322,923 such requests in 2018 alone.[[30]](#footnote-30) In this regard, ISPs should also respect and protect the privacy of users, and should not be compelled by the State to divulge information thereon without a court order.
2. Last but not least, States should themselves refrain from interfering with content of the message of the assembly through laws which affect online content. For instance, approximately, 52 nations including France, Russia, Denmark, Singapore, Egypt, and Brazil have laws against fake news. Some of these laws could serve to limit dissent and encourage support for controversial government policies, while others will serve to preserve truth in media.[[31]](#footnote-31) Indeed, it can be easily seen how the content of the message conveyed by an assembly, which is at the core of the right, could be affected. Furthermore, as illustrated by the Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and Association, in his recent report,[[32]](#footnote-32) cybercrime laws, anti-terrorism laws, surveillance laws (in addition to ‘fake news’ laws and freedom of assembly laws) could impinge on the right to exercise freedom of assembly online.

***4) The human rights challenges posed by the new technologies, including information and communications technology, in the context of assemblies, including peaceful protests (surveillance and monitoring tools by the authorities, including biometrics-based recognition technology to identify protestors).***

1. While the benefits of amplifying the message of assemblies through technology are numerous, the same technology can also be used against protesters who use it to co-ordinate their efforts. Traditional assemblies, allow participants if they so desire, a certain level of anonymity or at least a smaller likelihood of being ‘singled out’ or identified – due to the presence of other people. However, the use of new technologies does not always offer the same due to the availability of surveillance and tracking tools by the State or third parties.
2. The use and abuse of surveillance tools has been an area of growing concern for human rights, since the technologies themselves appeared. In May 2019, the UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Opinion and Expression, issued a special Report on “Surveillance and Human Rights”,[[33]](#footnote-33) which while focusing on the individual freedom of expression, calls for a moratorium on the sale of surveillance tools to States, until such time as adequate legal safeguards can be put in place. The Special Rapporteur expressed grave concerns at the uncontrolled nature of the surveillance tools industry, and given that the freedom of expression in inextricably linked with the right to peaceful assembly, consideration should be given to this report, in the context of assemblies, in general, as States should refrain from using surveillance tools to track (or less still, persecute) persons taking part in assemblies and protest actions. Such technologies include facial recognition tools, surveillance of Internet portals and social media sites used by activists and identification of a person’s whereabouts through location tracking (to establish attendance at a demonstration or rally). Such tools should only be employed where such interference can be justified based on strictly proven and proportional grounds of national security or public order and should be subject to judicial review.
3. In general, intrusive overt or covert surveillance methods should only be applied where there is clear evidence that imminent unlawful activities, such as violence or use of firearms are planned to take place during an assembly.[[34]](#footnote-34)
4. Digital images of organizers and participants in an assembly should not be recorded except where specifically authorized by law and necessary in cases where there is probable cause to believe that the planners, organizers or participants will engage in serious unlawful activity. The use of image recording for the purpose of identification (including facial recognition software)[[35]](#footnote-35) should be confined to those circumstances where criminal offences are actually taking place, or where there is a reasonable suspicion of imminent criminal behaviour. In all situations, there should be adequate safeguards against abuse.[[36]](#footnote-36) The taking and retention of digital imagery for purposes of identifying persons engaged in lawful activities, or the retention of data extracted from such images (such as details of an individual’s presence at an assembly) in a permanent or systematic record may give rise to violations of the right to privacy.[[37]](#footnote-37)
5. Moreover, the use of digital image recording devices by law enforcement officers during a public assembly may have a ‘chilling effect’ on freedom of peaceful assembly and curtail the exercise of this right.[[38]](#footnote-38) Laws, and policies of law enforcement agencies should codify operating procedures relating to digital recording at public assemblies, including a description of the (lawful and legitimate) purposes for and the circumstances in which such activities may take place, and procedures and policies for the retention and processing of resulting data.[[39]](#footnote-39) The information obtained in this manner should be destroyed after a reasonable period set out in law.[[40]](#footnote-40)

***5) The impact on human rights of the use of new less-lethal weapons and ammunition technology in the context of assemblies including peaceful protest***

1. As emphasized above, new technology of any kind can be used both to enhance and limit the right to peaceful assembly. Law enforcement officials must at all times respect human rights in their professional capacity.[[41]](#footnote-41) It is recognized that the use of force may be warranted during assemblies depending on the situation.[[42]](#footnote-42) Furthermore, there is an absolute ban (*jus cogens*) on torture, cruel and degrading treatment.[[43]](#footnote-43)
2. It can be an advantage that the increasing availability of various less lethal weapons can lead to greater restraint in the use of firearms and allow for graduated use of force, even if this depends on the context and the specific weapon. On the other hand less lethal weapons may by definition be lethal or may lead to serious injuries. Such risks will vary in the context of its use, and the vulnerabilities of the persons against whom they are used; bystanders may also be affected if the weapons are hard to direct at one person at the time.[[44]](#footnote-44)
3. Law enforcement officials should only resort to the use of force in line with the principles of exceptionality, proportionality and necessity, and they should differentiate between individuals engaged in violence and those who wish to assemble peacefully. These principles also apply to less-lethal weapons. Use of forceful methods of crowd control, including attenuated energy projectiles (AEPs), baton rounds or plastic/rubber bullets must be strictly regulated.[[45]](#footnote-45) ODIHR recommends to participating States to ensure that law enforcement officials are adequately trained, resourced and equipped (including with less lethal technologies) so as to best enable differentiated and proportionate use of force in the context of policing assemblies.[[46]](#footnote-46)
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