

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FIFTH INTERNET GOVERNANCE FORUM AGENDA AND FORMAT

As civil society participants involved in Internet Governance debate, in attention to the IGF Secretariat call for contributions, we hereby present a recommendation for the agenda and others related to the format of the next meeting, to be held at Vilnius, Lithuania.

1. Recommendation for the Vilnius meeting agenda

Whereas the Internet Governance Forum has among its principles the bottom-up process, which means the promotion of dialogue, according the interested stakeholders claims. Whereas some technical issues are already discussed at IGF, such as IPv6, IDNs etc, without directly overlapping the debates in other places like ITU, ICANN, etc. It is our understanding that it would be very important to have a debate about ENUM (E.164 Number Mapping) management and deployment in IGF context. We understand it as an Internet resource that potentially have a strong influence in users options regarding personal and institutional communication alternatives and prices.

ENUM is an Internet protocol defined by the RFC 3761 [1]. The E.164 is a ITU-T recommendation [2] used to organize the telephone numbers, while the Domain Name System is used to organize Internet resources. The ENUM combines both standards, by using DNS to locate resources connected to a specific E.164 number. For example, an user can register his telephone number at ENUM, and then attach other numbers and communication tools to it, such as: VoIP addresses, e-mails, I.M. accounts, etc, giving priority for each one. That way, this user can be found through these resources by giving only his telephone number. Another example: if an organization that uses a VoIP PBX gets the registration of its telephone numbers at ENUM, it can be reached by Internet, without using the PSTN (Public Switched Telephone Network), by other organizations.

By registering at ENUM the user is able to choose the communication channels to be contacted, if someone calls his telephone number. In other words, the user can experience the freedom to choose that any call received in that particular number will be re-arranged to a VoIP address, to other telephone number, to an e-mail, to an I.M. account, etc. The use of telephone numbers at Internet communication is very important, because people are already used to it. Therefore, ENUM could act as a catalyst to the technological convergence between Telecommunications and Internet. Moreover, ENUM mechanism has other advantages for the end-user, by reducing costs, since it facilitates the use of voIP, and other Internet based communication tools.

The ENUM management nowadays is jointly coordinated by ITU [3] and IAB [4]. The official domain e164.arpa, under which the numbers can be registered, is operated by RIPE NCC [5], according an agreement and rules defined by the IAB [6]. ITU has the responsibility to approve, deny and even revoke the requests for ENUM designation, and have been following the Telecommunications rules to fulfill it.

Despite the importance and benefits already listed, the deployment of ENUM on the Internet have some problems. There are only 9 countries [7] with the system working, but in some of them it is not popular, or not used in its full capability. Some countries are encountering administrative problems, difficulties arising from lack of agreement between Internet and Telecommunications providers and regulators, with the consequent denial of the ENUM designation by the ITU. Consequently, there are some alternative systems being used, such as the NRENUM.net [8], adopted in 13 countries, and the E164.org [9] initiative, where anyone can register a number. The original ENUM RFC is from September 2000 [10], and yet the protocol has a very low participation at Internet.

According the above mentioned elements, we consider ENUM as an Internet resource, since it uses primarily the DNS to integrate Internet with the telephone numbers. However, it has been managed mainly as a Telecommunications resource. Therefore, as an important Internet resource, in the first place, it should be discussed in Internet related spaces. It is necessary to have a dialogue concerning the management of ENUM as an Internet resource (technical aspect), and a reflection regarding the impact of ENUM standard for general users (social, legal and cultural aspects). A better understandment of ENUM and of the reasons that delay its deployment is very important to Internet users, as well finding solutions to improve the current situation.

Internet Governance Forum has the space to provide the multistakeholder dialogue to face those issues under, for example, the Critical Internet Resources arena, without overlapping the current ITU and IAB attributions.

2. Recommendations for the Vilnius meeting format

In order to promote better interaction among stakeholders and increase the open dialogue, IGF should reduce the overlapping between the parallel meetings (workshops, best practices etc) and the main sessions, preferably providing means of the results of parallel meetings to be informed and discussed in the main sessions. There are some possibilities, not limited to the following, of course, such as (i) the reduction of the meetings that happens in parallel related to the same theme; (ii) the isolation of the main

session in the agenda; and mainly a (iii) a spot close to the main session for parallel meetings organizers to report back their results.

Finally, we also recommend the renewal of the IGF mandate, under its principles and values, such as the multistakeholder and the bottom-up process. It also should continuously encourage more participation, which can be done by fostering the remote participation, reinforcing youth participation and local/regional debates.

This document is signed by individuals involved in the Internet Governance debate, through academic and professional lives, serving in their individual capacity.

Antonio M. Moreiras <moreiras@nic.br> and
Raquel F. Gatto, <rgatto@nic.br>,
from the Brazilian Network Information Center (NIC.br).

São Paulo, January 15th, 2010

References:

- [1] <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc3761>
- [2] <http://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-E.164/en>
- [3] <http://www.itu.int/osg/spu/enum/>
- [4] <http://www.iab.org/>
- [5] <http://www.ripe.net/enum/>
- [6] <http://www.ripe.net/enum/instructions.html>
- [7] <http://enumdata.org/>
- [8] <http://www.nrenum.net>
- [9] <http://www.e164.org>
- [10] <http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2916>

Other related resources:

- [a] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Telephone_Number_Mapping
- [b] <http://www.voip-info.org/wiki/view/ENUM>
- [c] <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/meetings/ripe-59/presentations/ribeiro-enum-why-not-die.pdf>
- [d] http://www.cisco.com/web/about/ac123/ac147/archived_issues/ipj_5-2/enum.html
- [e] <http://arstechnica.com/business/news/2010/01/enum-dragging-telephone-numbers-into-the-internet-age.ars/1>