

Internet Governance Forum (IGF)¹

Synthesis Paper

Open Consultations

Geneva, 9 February 2010

I. Introduction

1. This paper summarizes comments received in preparation of the fifth IGF meeting, which is to take place on 14-17 September 2010 in Vilnius, Lithuania. This version of the paper takes into account comments received by the IGF Secretariat in response to its call for contributions by 15 January 2010. There were 22 contributions received in time for this report.

2. As in the past years, the paper is defined as a work in progress and planned as a rolling document that will be updated regularly based on contributions, open consultations and Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) meetings. The paper will be updated in light of the discussions to be held at the Open Consultation on 9 February 2010 and the meeting of the MAG, on 10-11 February 2010. Additionally, after the February open consultations and the MAG meeting, a draft of the first view of the programme for Vilnius will be released for comment.

3. All of the contributions and open consultation transcripts will be posted on the IGF Web site throughout the preparatory process of the Vilnius meeting. The readers of this paper are encouraged to read those contributions and the open consultations transcripts for further details and in depth discussions.

4. The contributions touched on a great variety of issues. While some commented on the previous year's meeting, others made specific recommendations for the 2010 meeting. One paper analyzed African communities' contributions to the various lists concerned with Internet governance. Another paper provided an analysis of the effect of the economic downturn on Internet Governance.

5. There were some common threads throughout most contributions. Many underlined that the IGF remained a valuable venue for open dialogue among participants from all stakeholder groups and several commentators made a plea for an extension of the IGF mandate.

II. General comments on the Sharm El Sheikh meeting

6. Among the aspects appreciated by commentators were the following:

- The hospitality of the Egyptian hosts;
- The preparations done for the fourth IGF meeting;
- The provisions made for remote participation;
- The transcripts, summary reports, webcasts, audiocasts and other records; of the IGF meeting to be found on the IGF Web site.
- The frequent updating of the Web site during the meeting;
- The IGF You Tube site as a good addition to the IGF materials.

7. There was some criticism of other aspects related to the 2009 meeting, such as:

- There were too many speakers in some of the meetings;
- There were too many workshops;

¹ As in previous IGF papers, several often-used acronyms will be used in this paper. The first use in this paper will contain the full name with the acronym in parenthesis after which the acronym may be used without including the full name. For footnote references, a single name, either an acronym or a representative single word, will be used with the meanings and full names referenced in an appendix.

- Too many workshops had overlapping or duplicated topics.

8. In general, the overall theme of 'Creating opportunities for all' was found to have been an apt description for the fourth meeting.² The introductory session 'Setting the scene' and 'Regional perspectives' was generally well received and it was hoped that this session would be retained in Vilnius, with one comment suggesting that more time be allotted to this session.³ However, it was felt that the opening session was too long and had too many speakers.⁴

9. There was support for the roundtable format introduced in Sharm El Sheikh.⁵

10. It was appreciated that a programme, albeit incomplete, came out earlier than in previous years.⁶

11. The use and archive, of video and audio coverage in Sharm el Sheikh was seen as being of great value. There was also the need to improve the reporting of information and calls for further improvements to the Web site, though the improvements made in 2009 were acknowledged. The focus of the desired improvement related to an increase in issue based information and presentation. Another improvement would include the inclusion of a calendar on the IGF website that listed the various events organized by participants and dynamic coalitions.⁷

III. Substantive comments

12. On access and diversity, it was noted that access had been a main theme since the beginning of the IGF, and that a certain amount of consensus had been reached on this topic. There had also been a challenge to build on this consensus and to showcase and to share innovative practices by operators and regulators that had successfully advanced people's access to the Internet. The opportunity for this had been missed partly because the mechanism of a roundtable discussion that would have enabled such engagement had not been used to further the dialogue in this area. It was pointed out that access remained a critical component of Internet governance and that it still needed focus.⁸ While enabling policy as well as legal and regulatory environment remained important parts of facilitating access to Internet infrastructure, it was suggested that the discussions could be improved by addressing these policy aspects in the context of a session on development with human and institutional capacity building as a cross-cutting theme. It was also recommended that such a session should focus on policy implications and best practices.⁹

13. With regard to security, openness and privacy, several commentators noted that there was a major agreement among panellists from all stakeholder groups in the related main session that privacy and security could not to be traded off against one another or seen as opposing priorities that needed to be balanced. Both were seen as equally important.¹⁰ It was felt that it had worked well to treat this area as a set of interrelated topics in order to ensure a balanced presentation of the broad range of views and it was recommended that this should be continued in this manner also in future IGF meetings.¹¹

14. The session on critical Internet resources was seen as having worked very well with two moderators. It was recommended that perhaps more sessions could consider following this

² ETNO, ICC

³ COE

⁴ ETNO, ICC, ISOC

⁵ France

⁶ ETNO, ICC

⁷ France

⁸ APC

⁹ ICC

¹⁰ APC, IRD

¹¹ ICC

format. It was also recommended that this topic be repeated in Vilnius with a similar format.¹²

15. While the session on Internet governance in the light of WSIS Principles was seen as a valuable component of the fourth IGF meeting, it was not seen as needing a main session in 2010. However, a workshop might be appropriate to deal with this theme.¹³

16. Several contributions pointed to the increased importance of human rights concerns as reflected in both main sessions and workshops and proposed making human rights a main theme at the Vilnius IGF meeting. It was suggested that the challenge was to move away from general concern and look at specific ways in which upholding human rights could be achieved in practice and on the various roles played by the different stakeholders in achieving this. There was interest in looking at how human rights manifested themselves in the different areas of Internet governance. One of the recommendations for a main session was to look at the issues of a 'Human Rights Agenda' or 'Development Agenda for Internet Governance'.¹⁴

17. Another suggestion pointed out that 'Internet rights and principles' was a theme that had been discussed during the preparatory stages of every IGF, yet had not yet resulted in 'being given prominent space in the IGF agenda'. The contribution emphasized the importance of 'Internet rights and principles' as a major theme for the 2010 IGF.

18. A contribution from the Dynamic Coalition on Internet and Climate change recommended that the IGF process should highlight to a much greater extent the importance of including climate change as a key factor in any and all policies and frameworks that will shape the future growth of the Internet.¹⁵

19. As a topic for an emerging issues session it was suggested to discuss shaping 'Internet Governance approaches to meet innovation challenges and allow high tech-services and applications to help CO emissions.' This could be related to work being done in the OECD.¹⁶

20. One commentator suggested that in addition to discussing child abuse and pornography in relation to the Internet, the IGF should discuss the positive effects the Internet has in terms of people's sexual and reproductive rights, in terms of access to information, knowledge, freedom of expression and openness.¹⁷

21. It was proposed that global privacy standards and the Madrid Privacy Declaration be discussed at the next meeting, noting the fact that technological capabilities and business practices moved faster than legal protections. While in some areas the role of government was questioned, it was clear that governments had a responsibility for protecting privacy in law and through institutions.¹⁸

22. One issue that was recommended for discussion was data and cloud computing with a view to what happens to personal and other data. This was seen in one comment as an emerging issue not only about the personal data consumers entered into the cloud, but also about what happened to citizen's data moved to the cloud by institutions and governments. The privacy issues of cloud computing were seen as not having received ample study and discussion. There was a recommendation that this be discussed in 2010.¹⁹

23. There were several suggestions for a technical or introductory session to cover topics such as cloud computing, DNS redirections, or net neutrality for the non technical person. These sessions could also discuss how technology issues drive or impact policy development

¹² ETNO, ICC

¹³ ETNO, ICC

¹⁴ APC, IRD

¹⁵ DCICC

¹⁶ ICC

¹⁷ YCIG

¹⁸ EPIC

¹⁹ EPIC, ICC, Katoh

processes.²⁰

24. It was recommended to add ENUM (E.164 Number Mapping), a protocol for mapping PSTN telephone numbers based on ITU E.164 to DNS names, to the list of critical Internet resource topics. ENUM was described as having the potential to act as a catalyst for convergence of telecommunications and the Internet.²¹

25. Some of the suggestions for focused topics to be discussed at the next meeting, included:

- Counterfeit medicines and the sale of medical products on the Internet;
- State sovereignty and responsibility with respect to the Internet;
- Internet and the Law;
- Technical cooperation against cybercrime;
- Law enforcement responsibilities for cybercrime;
- The sexual exploitation and sexual abuse of children on the Internet;
- Effective redress in the new media environment;
- Search neutrality and the question of whether the selection of content needs to be neutral with respect to content;
- The public service value of social media;
- The human rights dimension of network neutrality;
- Enhancing access to information, transparency and participation in Internet governance;²²
- Protecting women's rights; looking at Internet content from a gender perspective;
- The role of the Internet in increasing the participation of people with disabilities in political and public life;
- Counterfeit medicines and the sale of medical products on the Internet.²³

26. Privacy and the smart electrical grid was recommended as a specific topic for discussion, as the electrical grid could enable the tracking of people's actions through their usage.²⁴

27. One contribution recommended that a session be held on the topic of "IGF Future" in Vilnius focusing on the continuing work of the IGF in areas such as capacity building and human rights.²⁵

IV. Comments on programme and logistics

28. Several writers suggested that the number of workshops be reduced or limited.²⁶ One suggestion was that no more than a predetermined fixed number, for example 50, of workshops would be allowed, with five assigned to each of the main sessions and 20 general workshops.²⁷ Another suggestion was that the experience of previous years could be reviewed for those themes that had generated a significant interest, with the MAG then putting out a call both for one or two workshops on these themes as well as an open call on new themes.²⁸

29. One commentator saw benefit in increasing stakeholder participation in defining the substantive programme.²⁹

²⁰ CIRA, ICC

²¹ Moreira & Gatto

²² COE

²³ CIRA

²⁴ EPIC

²⁵ Balleste

²⁶ France, Switzerland, COE, ETNO

²⁷ Switzerland, ETNO

²⁸ France, ETNO

²⁹ IGC

30. Another commentator held the view that it might be beneficial to organize sessions around 'structuring themes' that would clarify the different tracks that have emerged from the IGF work so far. Examples given were: 'Management of the Internet Common Resources', 'Governance of Social Media' or 'Embodiment of WSIS Principles in the Internet Governance Ecosystem'.³⁰

31. One contribution suggested that main sessions should be focused around specific questions as opposed to general themes as was the case in previous years.³¹ Others recommended that the main sessions become more targeted as well as action and future oriented.³²

32. There were calls for tangible outcomes involving the issuing of messages from the IGF.³³ Messages should come out of each of the sessions. A set of rapporteurs could be appointed to publish, in their own names, the key messages from sessions. These could then be put on line in a page that allowed other participants to comment on the key messages.³⁴

33. A different balance was recommended for main sessions and workshops. All main sessions did not need to be three hours in length. Nor did every time slot need to have a main session. One recommendation was to reduce the emphasis on main sessions in favour of workshops. A possibility mentioned was that workshops could be held in the morning without any conflicting main sessions.³⁵

34. Several commentators called for more interactive sessions with fewer panellists. It was also suggested that the diversity of workshop types should be encouraged. It was felt by some that diverse session types were most suited to topics at various stages and that diverse meeting types enhanced diversity of participation.³⁶

35. It was recommended that on some of the maturing themes, it could be advantageous to allow for longer workshops, e.g. two hours instead of 90 minutes.

36. More should be done to encourage participants to use the interpretation facilities in the main session and to use the UN languages when those were the native language of the speaker.³⁷ There was strong support for continuing with a schedule without any sessions held during the lunch hour.³⁸

37. It was suggested that the organizers of workshops should produce background documents and issue papers prior to the meeting. The organizers and others involved in the workshops also should be identified.

38. It was recommended that the reports from the workshops held at Sharm el Sheik's be consulted in developing the agenda for the main sessions in Vilnius.³⁹

39. Concrete suggestions on the organization of the physical meeting included:⁴⁰

- Shipping information should be available at least a month in advance;
- Visa information needed to be available long before the event;
- Registration should be quick and efficient;

³⁰ France

³¹ IRD

³² COE

³³ IGC

³⁴ Switzerland

³⁵ ETNO, ICC

³⁶ Switzerland, ICC, ISOC, IRD, PP

³⁷ ISOC

³⁸ ETNO, ICC

³⁹ Katoh

⁴⁰ ICC

- Refreshment such as coffee and tea should be available to participants at all times whether provided by the host or for sale;
- Computers with Internet access and printers needed to be available for all participants to use;
- Internet connections were necessary throughout the venue and the venue hotels and there should be Internet availability 24 hours a day for the duration of the event;
- The venue and the venue hotels should be set up to receive the number of participants and should have adequate business centre facilities and meeting rooms;
- The online schedule should be reformatted to make it easier to read and to print;
- Venue hotels should be close to the venue and close together to facilitate networking among the participants and to minimize travel time to the meetings;
- The village should be completed by the time the event begins.

40. Concrete comments concerning the media and media centre included:⁴¹

- There should be a formal way for the participants to communicate with the media;
- The media centre should be staffed with someone who could assist with media relations and coordination of interview opportunities;
- It would be helpful to have an area where participants could display media kits or announcements;
- The media centre should be easy to locate;
- There should be a list of registered media available at the end of the event;
- It would be helpful for participants to have photographs of the venue before the event.

V. General comments on the IGF and its functioning

41. One commentator saw a need for discussions on future mechanisms for deciding on the MAG composition and remit. The model used in preparation for the 2009 meeting where committed non-MAG members were allowed to contribute to the organization of main sessions was praised.⁴²

42. One commentator wrote that the composition of the MAG should be more evenly divided among the stakeholders and that the stakeholder groups should have a more direct role in the selection of MAG members.⁴³

43. There was a call for the MAG to include more youth representatives with respect both to geographic and gender balance.⁴⁴ Several comments identified a need for more participation by youth to ensure the inclusion of a new generation of ideas and professionals.⁴⁵

44. One comment pointed out that youth was not a homogenous group and that children, youth and young adults had different experiences of the Internet and were affected differently. The IGF needed to engage the various age brackets of youth and take into account the variety of their experience and needs. This extended to adapting session formats to make them more accessible to youth.⁴⁶

45. Another commentator wrote that other communities, such as older people, who had not participated, should also be encouraged to do so.⁴⁷ It was also noted that more attention should be paid to gender in public policy.⁴⁸

46. Several commentators saw a need for increased diversity of participation, in particular by bringing more representatives from developing countries to the IGF. One suggested way of increasing diversity was to choose representatives, who would have their participation supported

⁴¹ ICC

⁴² France

⁴³ IGC

⁴⁴ YCIG

⁴⁵ France, ISOC, PP, YCIG, Paque

⁴⁶ PP, YCIG

⁴⁷ COE

⁴⁸ COE

and who would be responsible for mobilizing their communities.⁴⁹

47. It was noted that the IGF needed to be opened up to more non-specialist lay participants. This required not only improved facilities for remote participation, but also that preparatory consultations, main sessions, and workshop be more accessible for 'everyday Internet users'.⁵⁰

48. As in previous years, several comments concerned remote participation and the need to develop better tools and practices.⁵¹ It was recommended that all remote sessions should have a moderator whose sole responsibility was remote participation. The organizers of workshops needed greater technical support. Remote participation needed guidelines, organization, training and needed to be considered as an integral part of workshop planning.⁵² It was also recommended that an open source platform be used for remote participation and that a section of the IGF Web site be dedicated to remote participation best practices, updates, guidelines, tools and other information.⁵³

49. One contribution proposed that remote participants register as formal IGF registrants.⁵⁴

50. A hub organizer encouraged the continued inclusion of two-minute video presentations for inclusion in the sessions.⁵⁵

51. The point was made that the role of dynamic coalitions should be clarified, with regard to structure, multistakeholder representations and their ability to do inter-sessional work. Thematic IGFs, held between the annual events, were mentioned as a way to feed into the MAG for workshops.⁵⁶

52. One recommendation was to facilitate inter-sessional work and to organize thematic working groups to develop background material and IGF discussion syntheses on major Internet governance themes.⁵⁷

53. Several comments praised the introduction of regional and national forums. It was suggested that the IGF and dynamic coalitions could do more to encourage them and to assist in their creation and functioning.⁵⁸ It was also suggested that input papers to the IGF be encouraged from national and regional IGFs.⁵⁹

54. One contributor saw a need for greater integration of discussions and themes between the national and regional IGFs and the IGF meeting. Part of this was ascribed to the fact that the records were scattered and piecemeal and that documents were not hyperlinked appropriately.⁶⁰

55. One organization suggested that the IGF could be the "starting point for the growth of new ideas - a fertile landscape for policy development." The contribution went on to suggest that this should influence the selection of topics, speakers and the tone of the Forum.⁶¹

56. One commentator saw in what he described as the independence and neutrality of the secretariat one of the great assets of the IGF. If it were to produce synthetic papers on specific topics before or after an IGF, it would contribute to making the impact of the IGF greater. The same

⁴⁹ Switzerland

⁵⁰ IRP

⁵¹ France, APC, ETNO, ICC, IRP, RPWG, YCIG Lohento, Paque

⁵² IRP, RPWG, Paque

⁵³ Paque

⁵⁴ Paque

⁵⁵ Paque

⁵⁶ France

⁵⁷ IGC

⁵⁸ France

⁵⁹ France

⁶⁰ IRP

⁶¹ CIRA

commentator also identified the need for predictable and sufficient multistakeholder financing to maintain the secretariat.

57. It was noted that while the discussion of outcomes was ongoing, the IGF should continue to exclude the negotiation of text from its remit.⁶² The ability to discuss and not negotiate was seen as a one of a kind capability that enabled 'participant's time to be put to good and practical use.⁶³

58. It was pointed out that the IGF was a dynamic system in that it reconsidered what it had done in an effort to improve itself in a self-organizing manner.⁶⁴ This was seen as a strength and the question was asked whether it was easier to remain a dynamic organization because it did not have any decision-making power.⁶⁵

59. One commentator felt that the IGF should interact further with other organizations involved in Internet governance.⁶⁶

60. It was suggested that understanding the financial crisis could help the IGF in coming to consensus on whether it should remain a forum restricted to multistakeholder dialogue - or whether it should move toward a more action oriented framework with a right to take action as envisioned in the WSIS action lines. It was also suggested that the IGF had a role in helping to enhance cooperation among stakeholders.⁶⁷

⁶² France

⁶³ ICC

⁶⁴ France

⁶⁵ OII

⁶⁶ France

⁶⁷ OII

Comments included in this synthesis paper were received from the following:

France	Bertrand de La Chapelle, Special Envoy for the Information Society, French Ministry for Foreign and European Affairs
Switzerland	Thomas Schneider, Federal office of Communications (OFCOM), Switzerland
COE	Council of Europe
APC	Association for Progressive Communications
CIRA	Canadian Internet Registration Authority
EPIC	Electronic Privacy Information Center
ETNO	European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association
ICC	International Chamber of Commerce, Business Action to Support the Information society
IGC	Internet Governance Caucus
ISOC	Internet Society
OII	Oxford Internet Institute
PP	Practical Participation Ltd.
IRP	Internet Rights and Principles Dynamic Coalition
DCICC	Dynamic Coalition on Internet and Climate Change
RPWG	Remote Participation Working Group
YCIG	Youth Coalition on Internet Governance
Balleste	Professor Roy Balleste, Director of the Law Library and Associate Professor of Law at St. Thomas University School of Law, Miami Gardens, Florida, U.S.A.
Katoh	Masanobu Katoh Senior Vice President, Fujitsu Laboratories, representing Nippon Kiedanren
Lohento	Ken Lohento, Forum on Internet Governance, which way for Africa
Moreiras & Gatto	Antonio M. Moreira and Raquel F. Gatto, of the Brazilian Network Information Center in their independent capacity
Paque	Ginger (Virginia) Paque
Rodriguez	Madrid Privacy Declaration submitted by Katitza Rodriguez