Endorsements for JNC's Open letter objecting to acceptance of Encrypted Media Extensions as a W3C standard

Dear Sir Tim,

Further to our open letter of 2017-04-12 (a copy is attached), we have in the meantime received for this letter 25 organizational endorsements and 189 individual endorsements, which we convey to you herewith.

Sincerely,
Norbert Bollow
Co-convener, Just Net Coalition
info@justnetcoalition.org

Organizational endorsements

1. Agencia Latinoamericana de Información - ALAI, Ecuador
2. ALTERNATIVA ECONÓMICA Crítica y Réplica, Colombia
3. ASSA8 Aasociacion de solidaridad Salvador Allende, Spain
4. Association for promotion of sustainable development, India
5. Bangladesh NGOs Network for Radio & Communication, Bangladesh
6. BloggerPrise Contenidos, Uruguay
7. CEH Arturo Jauretche, Argentina
8. Centre for e-Parliament Research, Bangladesh
9. Centro de Estudios Humanistas de Córdoba, Argentina
10. Co.lab, Brazil
11. Connecting.nyc Inc., USA
12. Coordinadora Latinoamericana de Organizaciones del Campo (CLOC), Latin America
13. Craol Community Radio Network, Ireland
14. Diverse Voices and Action (DIVA) for Equality, Fiji
15. El Nuevo Cronista, Argentina
16. EMPOWER INDIA, India
17. Instituto de Desarrollo de la Economia Asociayiva, Rep. Dominicana
18. IT for Change, India
19. Pontydysgu Ltd, UK
20. Post-Media Lab, Germany/World
21. Stichting bibliotheken Midden Fryslân, Netherlands
22. Programa de Educación para la Paz-PROEPAZ, Peru
23. Pressenza, Ecuador
24. Radialistas Apasionadas y Apasionados, Ecuador
25. Radios Libres, Ecuador

Individual endorsements

1. Abraham Pavon Salazar, teacher, Honduras
2. Adela Delgado Pop, Guatemala
3. Alan MacLennan, lecturer, Scotland
4. Aleksandr Zykov, Russia
5. Alex Llumiquinga, Ecuador
6. Alexandre José da Rocha Moreira, Brazil
7. Alexandros Triantafyllidis, software engineer, Greece
8. Alexis Pacheco R., Honduras
9. Alicia Aparicio, Argentina
10. Alicia Madrid, Canada
11. Ana Cristhina Lemes, São Paulo
12. Ana Paula Santos Pereira Sequeiros, researcher, Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra, Portugal
13. Andrea Cochetti, Argentina
14. Andro Ortiz Dieguez, Union de informaticos de Cuba, Cuba
15. Andrés Fernando Cortez, usuario, El Salvador
16. Andrés Herrera, SysAdm, Spain
17. Andrés Pino, Chile
18. Angela Elvira Fuentes Agüero, profesora universitaria, Cuba
19. Anne Kaun, Associate Professor in Media and Communication Studies, Sweden
20. Antonio Argemiro Burgos, Colombia
21. Antonio Hernández Pérez, consultant, Spain
22. Antonio J. González Plessmann, Surgentes. Colectivo de DDHH, Venezuela
23. Ariana López, Red en Defensa de la Humanidad-Cuba, Cuba
24. Armand Mattelart, Université Paris-VIII, France
25. Armando Torras, electronic engineer, Cuba
26. Arturo Menéndez Cabezas, MD, PhD, Professor, University of Medical Sciences, Camaguey, Cuba
27. Arumugam Sankar, EMPOWER INDIA, India
28. Bernardo García, editor, Colombia
29. Bogdan Trifunovic, digital projects librarian, Serbia
30. Boris Klompus, USA
31. Camille Lee, MLIS Candidate, Canada
32. Carlos Andres Martin, docente, Argentina
33. Carlos Morales Iglesias, scientific researcher, Spain
34. Chandra Singh Kulung, Nepal
35. Chris Bissell, ICT scholar, UK
36. Christian Grueny, philosopher, Germany
37. Christoph B. Graber, Professor of Law, Chair for Legal Sociology and Media Law, University of Zurich, Switzerland

38. Cristobal Gonzalez Ramirez, Colombia
39. Dan Maitland, human rights activist, Canada
40. Dare Samuel Adeleke, Polytechnic Digital Library, The Federal Polytechnic, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria
41. David Chapman, Senior Lecturer, The Open University, UK
42. David Peter Kelly, Switzerland
43. Deborah Withers, UK
44. Diane Mercier, courtière en connaissances, Canada
45. Dianne Oberg, Professor Emerita, University of Alberta, Canada
46. Dick Kaser, Editor, Computers in Libraries Magazine, USA
47. Diego Nicolas Alderete, user, Argentina
48. Dr. Maureen Ellis, Senior Research Associate at UCL-IoE London University and Associate Lecturer at Open University, UK
49. Dr. Syed Mustafa Ali, Lecturer, The Open University, UK
50. Dr. Kai Droege, Institute for Social Research, Frankfurt, Germany; and University for Applied Science, Lucerne, Switzerland
51. Dr. Peter Waterman, Institute of Social Studies, The Hague (retired), Netherlands
52. Dr. Steve Walker, Senior Lecturer, The Open University, UK
53. Eber Fernando Ordoñez, Argentina
54. Edmundo Murrugarra Florián, Perú
55. Eduardo Alejandro Méndez Azguí, researcher (law and history), Cuba
56. Emil Balcazar Lara, apoyo a la solicitud de mantener una Web democratica y equitativa
57. Emily Martinez, artist, US
58. Evelyn Rottengatter, Germany
59. Feliciano Castaño Villar, University of Granada, Spain
60. Felipe Lòpez, Argentina
61. Florence Owor, higher education librarian, UK
62. Florian Sprenger, Junior Professor for Media and Cultural Studies, Goethe-University Frankfurt, Germany
63. Francisco Gabriel Rodriguez Torres, Argentina
64. Francisco Olivares, journalist, Chile
65. Francois Soulard, World Forum of Free Media, Argentina
66. Fred Flagg, university Scholarly Communications worker, UK
67. Fulgencio Rueda, Venezuela
68. Gabriel Jesus Montalba Hernandez, dirigente social, Chile
69. Gisela Lopez, US
70. Gonzalo Fernando Mondaca Gutiérrez, ingeniero ambiental, Bolivia
71. Harry Halpin, security researcher, France/USA
72. Homero Saltalamacchia, UNTREF, Argentina
73. Horacio Furlan, Argentina
74. Hugh Govan, Fiji

75. Ignácio Dotto Neto, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Brazil
76. Iroel Sánchez Espinosa, blogger and informatic engineer, Cuba
77. Isabel Ducca Durán, Costa Rica
78. Isel Llerena del Castillo, Red en Defensa de la Humanidad-Cuba, Cuba
79. Jaider Camilo Perez Salamanca, sociólogo, Colombia
80. Jan Beilicke, free and open source advocate, Germany
81. Javier Obregón, Argentina
82. Jean-Louis Fulsack, President CESIR (NGO), France
83. Jennifer Holt, University of California, Santa Barbara, USA
84. Jesus Angel Pirela Cedeño, ESA Consultores, Venezuela
85. Jesús González Sarabia, México
86. Joao Paulo Cardielos, University of Coimbra, Portugal
87. John Whalley, Librarian, UK
88. Jorge Merlo, Ecuador
89. Jose Castro Pozo, Escritor - Poet - Past Pdte. ANEA Lima, Peru
90. Jose Manuel Arizaga Álvarez, economista, España
91. Josep Vicenç Marín Oliva, Spain
92. José Enrique Poma Loja, servidor público, Ecuador
93. José Miguel Angel Verdecchia, docente/investigador social, Paraguay
94. José Rafael Luque, Abogado, Venezuela
95. José Rosario Marroquín Farrera, Universidad Iberoamericana, Puebla, México
96. José Vicente Rodríguez Muñoz, professor, Spain
97. Joyce Kirk, emeritus professor, Australia
98. João Humberto Morgado Figueiredo Silva, Centro de Estudos Sociais da Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal
99. Juan José Bellido, librarian, Perú
100. Juan Paco, Internet user, Peru
101. Julio González Esteves, logistico, Argentina
102. Julio Macias, university professor, Cuba
103. Karolina Andersdotter, librarian and digital rights activist, Sweden
104. Kate Perris, UK
105. Kath Osborn, librarian and repository manager, UK
106. Keith Sanborn, Bard College, The New School, USA
107. Lieke Ploeger, community builder SPEKTRUM, Germany
108. Ligia Noemí Aguilar Salazar, profesora jubilada, México
109. Lincoln James Dahlberg, University of Queensland, Australia
110. Lisa McFarlane, Internet user, UK
111. Lisa Nathan, Assistant Professor, iSchool, University of British Columbia, Canada
112. Lucas Eliseo Bolatti, Argentina
113. Lucy Astra Matheson, librarian, UK
114. Luis Alberto Mendieta, writer, Ecuador

115. Luis Fernando Siles Zúñiga, Costa Rica
116. Luis Horacio Acosta, Argentina
117. Luis Mora Castillo, Apoyo pleno a Carta21463, Nicaragua
118. Manuel Bello, librarian, México
119. Manuel Fernández, México
120. Marc GUILLAUME, France
121. Marcello Lussana, Phd student, Germany
122. Marcelo Zabalaga, Central Bank of Bolivia, Past President, Bolivia
123. Marcelo da Luz Batalha, sociologist and PhD researcher at State University of Campinas (Unicamp), Brazil
124. Marco Berlinguer, IGOP UAB, Spain
125. Marcos González Bahamonde, España
126. Maria I Tamargo, Interamerican University of Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico
127. Maria Jose P. F. Carvalho, Biblioteca Norte|Sul, Portugal
128. Maria Manuel Borges, University of Coimbra, Portugal
129. Maria Matamala, Chile
130. Marianne Posner, director, libraries department, Tel-Aviv - Yafo Municipality, Israel
131. Mariano Solis Leyva, México
132. Marina Vishmidt, writer, UK
133. Marita Erna Simon, Austria
134. Martha Attridge Bufton, university subject specialist, Canada
135. Matthew Hanchard, UK
136. Mauro O. González, writer, Cuba
137. Melissa Hofmann, librarian, educator, and protector of fair use, USA
138. Michael Powell, author, UK
139. Michel Menou, retired university professor of information science, France
140. Miguel Eugenio Toro Buenaventura, Colombia
141. Miguel Ángel Cadena Hernández, politólogo, Colombia
142. Milagros Valdeavellano Roca Rey, Religiosa del Sagrado Corazón-educadora, Peru
143. Milton Rene Soto Santiesteban, Ambassador of Bolivia in Sweden
144. Minka Stoyanova, artist/academic, USA
145. Molly Hankwitz, PhD, writer/editor, USA
146. Mélodie Fenez, Germany
147. Namita Aavriti, writer, India
148. Nathasha Alvarez, academic librarian, USA
149. Neil longley, web user, UK
150. Nelsy Julieta Lizarazo Castro, Ecuador
151. Nicolas Cruz Tineo, Rep. Dominicana
152. Nora Schmidt, Lund University, Schweden
153. Osvaldo Kreimer, Universidad Nacional de San Martin, Argentina
154. Otelo Martinez, progresista, Cuba
155. Pablo Quevedo Mejía, contador público/servidor público, Venezuela

156. Paolo Monella, University of Palermo, Italy
157. Patricia Serafini, librarian, University of Toronto, Canada
158. Patricia Vieira, University of Coimbra, Portugal
159. Pedro Cagigal, academic, Ecuador
160. Pedro Castillo, Educador, Panamá
161. Pedro Guillermo Remón Ares, Venezuela
162. Prof. Peter J Lor, University of Pretoria, South Africa
163. Rafael Pla-Lopez, retired professor of the Universitat de Valencia, Spain
164. Rajmohan Oruganti, India
165. Rashidah Begum, librarian, Malaysia
166. Rebeca Cuevas, docente universitaria, México
167. Renée Castro-Pozo, profesora - editora, Canada
168. Robert Bentancur, Uruguay
169. Roberto Savio, Other News, Italia
170. Rosa García, internauta, México
171. Rosa Sadler, UK
172. Rubens Ribeiro Gonçalves da Silva, Full Professor - Information Science Institute - Federal University of Bahia, Brasil
173. Rumi Graham, librarian, Canada
174. Samantha Kaplan, UNC Chapel Hill, USA
175. Samir Hachani, Algiers' University 2, Algeria
176. Sean Burns, assistant professor, US
177. Shalini Bhutani, legal researcher, India
178. Silvia Eggli, web user, Switzerland
179. Tapas Ray, social science researcher, formerly engineer and journalist, India
180. Thomas Daniel Wilson, Editor-in-Chief, Information Research
181. Usha Rodrigues, academic, Deakin University, Australia
182. Vallo Kelder, teacher and librarian, Estonia
183. Veronica Leon Burch, filmmaker, Ecuador
184. Victor Bravo, investigador, Argentina
185. Victor Selabe, Botswana
186. Virginia Kuhn, Associate Professor, School of Cinematic Arts, University of Southern California, USA
187. Walker Vizcarra Gaibor, fotógrafo - educador, Ecuador
188. Xan Goodman, librarian, USA
189. Yves La Neuville, Canada

Open letter from Just Net Coalition to Sir Tim Berners-Lee seeking his urgent intervention to stop acceptance of Encrypted Media Extensions as a W3C standard

The Just Net Coalition[1] (JNC) comprises several dozen organisations and individuals from different regions globally concerned with Internet governance, human rights and social justice, and the relationship between them.

Dear Sir Tim,

The Just Net Coalition strongly objects to the recommendation of Encrypted Media Extensions (EME) by the World Wide Consortium (W3C) because of the danger it poses to the interests of the billions of people who already as a direct consequence of W3C's continued acquiescence have had dangerous and opaque DRM code installed on their device without their consent or even knowledge. DRM (Digital Rights Management) is a technical means to remotely control what a user can or cannot do on her own device. The official recommendation of EME by W3C, in default of substantial considerations of user rights and control by you, the Director of the W3C, will spread dangerous DRM to even more people across the globe, including developing countries in the Global South where DRM will cause tremendous harm. Although this seems to be an obscure issue of standardization, the spread of DRM represents a clear challenge to social justice.

In this regard we would like to fully support the positions expressed in the letter written to you by Frank La Rue, Assistant Director-General Communication and Information at UNESCO.[2] We appeal to you to take into consideration these views expressed by the UN agency responsible for promoting free expression, education, science and culture.

People, in particular in the Global South, are struggling for access to information and the W3C, with its global mandate, has the responsibility to enable access to information for all rather than for helping build financial and technical walls to this information on behalf of a few large and wealthy private sector content providers. Simply put, DRM code in a browser hands control over a user's screen to this cabal of content providers, technically enforcing their ability to extract payment, ignoring any sovereign rights of the user or of the nation where they reside.

The Web is larger than North America and Europe, and certainly larger than the corporations represented by the HTML Media Extensions Working Group. Currently, DRM functions only to preserve and enhance the profit margins of a few powerful mostly USA-based, corporations including Hollywood content syndicates such as the Motion Picture Association of America and the newer digital overlords of content such as Google's YouTube and Netflix, while simultaneously preventing the fair use and free sharing of information by ordinary people. As those of us aligning

1   http://justnetcoalition.org
2   https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/eme_letter_frank_la_rue.pdf

with the Just Net Coalition's Delhi Declaration[3]
have stated, "Many technical, and thus purportedly
'neutral', decisions have in reality led to social injustice as technology architectures, often developed to promote vested interests, increasingly determine social, economic, cultural and political relationships and processes."

The US DMCA[4] and related laws around DRM force people to pay for content even when access is their legal right due to "fair use" and other limitations on copyright, and so DRM is incompatible with fundamental and widely shared principles of democratic and individual sovereignty. The work of the W3C in this area on EME aggravates the situation even more than the pre-EME situation of third-party plug-ins, where, by contrast people throughout the world at least had the chance to reject DRM by opting out of installing a plug-in.

In its response[5] to the UNESCO statement cited above, the W3C states: "The alternative to EME allowing interaction with copyrighted content in Web browser plugins is abandoning the Web. Without in-browser decryption ability, content providers would use their own native application, which will have much more leeway to spy on the user, and possibly infect their machine." In other words, W3C appears to be concerned that without EME-DRM on the web, many movies and traditional TV style commercial content may get taken off the open web, and be provided through apps.

In our view, we should not be afraid of that. Let copyright owners take their content where they wish to take it. The Internet and the web were never originally intended to broadcast copyright material. Even if that material "goes away", we will have saved the open Internet/web for what it was originally meant for: peer-to-peer (p2p) sharing and communication. The open Internet/web also allows content businesses to use it, as long as their interests do not triumph over those of the common person. Content businesses can use the open Internet/web by employing business models that work with the open web. If not, then they can go ahead and develop private channels to the consumers – that is their right.

But we should not be intimidated by their threats. We should not change the Internet/web for them. We know that the big content providers want to use the web and not native apps, because the latter leaves them at a disadvantage. Such a disadvantage is a natural and just consequence of their attempt to control our means of communication, and so let them suffer it. P2p and ethical commercial content will continue to use the web, and we need to provide such content the advantage of the commons of the web.

Let traditional movie/TV style content go to native apps if that is what their owners want. That does not do any substantial damage to the open Internet/web. On the other hand, by keeping the web open, we will be ensuring a very useful advantage to p2p and ethical commercial content. That, in our view, is the duty of the custodians of our commons, like the W3C.

And do not heed the threats from commercial interests. They are not aligned with what people want.

3   http://justnetcoalition.org/delhi-declaration
4   Digital Millennium Copyright Act
5   https://www.w3.org/blog/news/archives/6225

It is the power of the people, voting with their feet, which made the Internet/web what is is today, and it is this power that will sustain it. It will not be sustained by succumbing to the threats of big content owners or by making deals with them that are only in their favour. Big content owners have always been against the open and egalitarian character of this new communication infrastructure, and have consistently resisted most forms of technical innovation. We did not allow them to win back when video recorders were invented, nor ever since, including during the early days of the Internet.

Let us not let them win now. We need to maintain our ethical stance. A global standards body must weigh in on the side of the common people against the powerful. The web must remain what it was originally meant to be – an egalitarian digital space. If it tries to dance to corporate tunes, it will lose its soul.

In this instance, if W3C were to adopt EME as a Recommendation without demanding substantial changes to increase user control and security, everyone on the planet – including in countries where democratic parliaments have intentionally refused to adopt certain of the atrocious rules propagated by the DMCA – will effectively be subject to web browser-based DRM whose only purpose is to enforce without prior consent (either individual or on a national basis) the DMCA, a creature of US corporate and national self-interest based on financial greed. Pre-emptive proprietary locks on digital content are, it should be evident, the moral equivalent of the uncontrolled selling of user data by corporations, as both are acting clearly in opposition to the public interest and the basis of social well-being. If you can take a stand for user privacy, over which you have no control, why can you not take a stand for user control over content, where you and W3C can exercise actual control?[6]

Surely, it is not acceptable to impose, de facto, US law on the entire world through the agency of an ostensibly neutral standards-making organization purporting to act in the broad global public interest. It is not surprising that such actions have the effect of bringing these standards making bodies into disrepute and suggest to many, particularly in developing countries, that any such organization is willy nilly acting as an arm of developed countries', and overwhelmingly the US, economic interest and domination.

By standardizing EME, the W3C would appear to be enabling a new form of digital colonialism that perpetuates structural inequality by locking away content from those who have the most need for it, while having the least means for financial access. It thus has the effect, amongst others, of preventing innovation and stifling content sharing on the Web by making difficult effective digital contributions by and from lesser resourced individuals, groups and regions of the world. For the least resourced and under-privileged, access to information is an important lifeline to raise themselves up so as to realize their own full potential. Why should the people of the world be forced through technological means to pay for content to which they would in many, if not in most, instances otherwise have unrestricted or low cost access negotiated on their behalf by national governments, educational institutions and others?

 The W3C standardizing of EME will spread DRM and so lead to more insecurity for users, not less, as "sandboxing" — an ameliorative technique to limit the execution of DRM code to a part of

6   https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/apr/04/tim-berners-lee-online-privacy-interview-turing-award

the browser — only attempts to limit the harm
caused by giving a third party corporation control
of your computer's video, but it does not eliminate it. "Sandboxing" is incompletely implemented
by open source browsers like Mozilla and is more easily hacked than Google's browser today, and
will likely continue to be easily hacked in the future.[7] Google's DRM has, indeed, already been
hacked by researchers.[8] A "sandbox" serves as no magical panacea for the security and privacy
harms inflicted by EME on all users. There is no reason major corporations or intelligence agencies
cannot use opaque DRM code as spyware to invade user privacy and to hack the computers of
ordinary users.

The Web as an open space for the free sharing of information —which was as designed by you as
the original intent of the web— will instead now become a platform for pay-for-play access to
content. The Electronic Freedom Foundation (EFF) covenant[9] offered a way to at least ameliorate
this harm, but it was prematurely rejected by the W3C, leading to the current state of affairs where
the W3C is asking security and privacy researchers to commit to so-called "responsible disclosure"
under US law, ignoring both their own national law and international law, and common sense in
terms of security in order to favor the business model of corporations for whom security disclosures
may harm their profit margins. Worse, DRM also has a chilling connection to the future of
surveillance and censorship. As Frank La Rue correctly noted, widespread adoption of DRM will
move Internet censorship from the network to the browser, leading we would expect to this new
feature from the W3C being integrated as a tool in the Internet control armoury of authoritarian (and
other) regimes increasingly acting to oppose an "Open Web" and "Open Internet".[10]

This is a critical 'turning-point' for the future of the Open Web. Your role as a global spokesperson
and moral force on behalf of an Open Web, allowing you to act in the public interest globally,
strongly suggests that you can break away from the growing process of "accommodation" with the
corporate interests promoting DRM, just as you have done in the recent past on issues such as mass
surveillance and net neutrality.

Approval of EME as a formal W3C Recommendation would greatly increase the risk of the original
open model of the Web itself disappearing, as integration of DRM with web browsers will
inevitably result in reducing user control and lead to centralization of control over web
functionality. Your views against the centralization of the Web and fake news, as you have often and
strongly presented, will only be reinforced by your taking the opportunity to say NO to a significant
enclosuring of the Web which will follow inevitably from DRM. After EME, we are all aware the
next step will be general-purpose DRM for HTML as pushed by the publishing industry due to the
W3C merger with IPDF.[11] It seems inevitable that in a world with EME, the web browser will
increasingly be used by a small oligarchy of powerful corporations to gain ever more power over
the cultural and economic life of humanity, while making it ever more difficult for new alternative
browsers to be developed.

7   https://securityzap.com/pwn2own-2017-chrome-remains-winner-browser-security/
8   http://securityaffairs.co/wordpress/48820/hacking/google-widevine-drm-flaw.html
9   https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2016/03/security-researchers-tell-w3c-protect-researchers-who-investigate-browsers
10   https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/eme_letter_frank_la_rue.pdf
11   https://www.w3.org/2017/01/pressrelease-idpf-w3c-combination.html.en

The Just Net Coalition has long supported your positions on the Open Web, as well as the W3C and Web Foundation's efforts to keep the Web open and accessible for all. Due to financial constraints, most people in the Just Net Coalition and in the larger civil society cannot afford to attend standards meetings or pay W3C's fees to allow us to participate in the W3C gatherings. We have no choice but to ask you Sir Tim, (and the W3C) directly and personally, to listen to this input from civil society and to reject the transition of EME to a W3C Recommendation.

Given that, as Director of the W3C it is within your power to veto further work or standardization on EME and so halt the spread of DRM, it is, in our view, your moral responsibility to reject EME. You must take action on DRM, or significant damage will be done to your legacy of defending an Open Web. At a minimum, you should demand that the W3C recommend that browsers provide adequate "opt-in" user control and work to establish the protection for users given by the EFF covenant.

The Internet pioneer Louis Pouzin put it very aptly, "Institutional standards should not contain elements pushed in by lobbies, since they are detrimental to public interests. Of course lobbies have financial and political means to ignore or distort standards in their products, but they want more. They need the guarantee of a reputable standard institution or outstanding individuals to boost the legalization of their marketing strategy. Resisting lobbies pressure is the name of the game for keeping a respected reputation."

The web stands at a crossroad. We sincerely hope that you are willing and able to exercise your global leadership role and responsibility on the topic of DRM. Please note that the Just Net Coalition and associated sympathetic groups around the world will help you in any way possible in this effort if you take a stand by vetoing EME's progress at the W3C.

 Sincerely,

Norbert Bollow

Co-convener, Just Net Coalition

info@justnetcoalition.org