



**IGF** Internet  
Governance  
Forum



**IGF 2015**  
*João Pessoa, Brasil*

## **The 10th Internet Governance Forum (IGF) Chair's Summary<sup>1</sup>**

**• 10-13 November 2015, João Pessoa, Brazil •**

---

<sup>1</sup> All interested stakeholders are encouraged to visit the IGF website for full transcripts of all the main sessions and workshops that took place throughout the week at the 10th IGF. The IGF YouTube channel also contains videos of all the sessions. • <http://www.intgovforum.org> • <http://www.youtube.com/user/igf> • <https://twitter.com/intgovforum> #IGF2015 •

**Table of Contents:**

**Executive Summary.....3**

**Highlights.....3**

**Outputs and Recommendations.....5**

**Extended Summary.....7**

**10<sup>th</sup> IGF Session Outputs and Reports.....15**

**2015 Best Practice Forums (Executive Summaries) .....16**

**IGF Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion (Synthesis).....22**

**IGF WSIS+10 Consultations Summary.....28**

## Executive Summary:

The IGF's tenth annual meeting took place during an important time for not only the future of Internet governance and the IGF in the ongoing process of reviewing the progress made on the World Summit on Information Society (WSIS) outcomes, but also for making sure that Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) and the Internet will support and help to enable the recently adopted 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development<sup>2</sup>.

The tenth annual meeting of the IGF was held from the 10<sup>th</sup> to the 13<sup>th</sup> of November 2015 in João Pessoa, Brazil. More than 2,400<sup>3</sup> registered participants from over 116 countries attended the meeting, with thousands more actively participating online. The overarching theme for IGF 2015 was: 'Evolution of Internet Governance: Empowering Sustainable Development'.

This theme was timely, as the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) has just adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and is reviewing the implementation of the WSIS outcomes at its 70th Session in December. Output-oriented debates and discussions during the four-day meeting addressed both opportunities and challenges under the following sub-themes: Cybersecurity and Trust; Internet Economy; Inclusiveness and Diversity; Openness; Enhancing Multistakeholder Cooperation; Internet and Human Rights; Critical Internet Resources; and Emerging Issues.

Throughout the preparatory process and during the annual meeting the IGF, which derives its mandate from the WSIS Tunis Agenda, has played a key role in facilitating policy debates related to these themes at this critical moment for the future of Internet governance. As a multistakeholder platform to facilitate constructive discussions about emerging Internet governance challenges, the IGF hosted more than 150 sessions throughout the week and enabled the IGF's various community-driven intercessional activities to promote the collaborative work they have been delivering throughout the year and provided the broader IGF community an opportunity to contribute feedback on a variety of significant outcomes.

## Highlights:

- IGF 2015 was planned in consultation with the host country and in accordance with guidance from the IGF's Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG). Both the preparatory and the intercessional work of the IGF were guided by **recommendations of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) Working Group on Improvements to the IGF**<sup>4</sup>.
- In line with the CSTD Working Group recommendations, the IGF demonstrated its capacity to produce **tangible outcomes** within multistakeholder collaboration frameworks. Mobilising the inherent benefits of solving problems through a diversity of perspectives, and building on a busy and compelling agenda, the IGF community was united this year in its willingness to address complex issues and work towards concrete solutions.

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2015-attendance-statistics>

<sup>4</sup> [http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/a67d65\\_en.pdf](http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/a67d65_en.pdf)

- IGF 2015 again aimed to facilitate **increased participation** among stakeholders from developing countries and to enhance linkages between the growing number of National and Regional IGF initiatives, the global IGF and the rest of the Internet governance ecosystem. Insights and outputs from the more than 40 National and Regional IGF initiative meetings<sup>5</sup> that took place in the past year served as valuable inputs at IGF 2015.
- Co-facilitators of the WSIS+10 High-Level Review, H.E. Mr. Janis Mazeiks, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Latvia and H.E. Mrs. Lana Zaki Nusseibeh, Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates, attended the 10<sup>th</sup> IGF and reported that views from the multistakeholder community during the consultations held at the IGF would inform the UN General Assembly High-level Meeting on the overall review of the implementation of the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society, taking place on 15-16 December 2015 at UN Headquarters in New York
- The presence and active participation of the UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the UN Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy in the digital age enriched debates throughout the week related to **human rights**. Privacy issues were debated at length in many of the workshops, where it was stressed that encryption and anonymity need to be reinforced around the world whilst respecting other human rights. Other workshops emphasized that privacy, transparency and security need to complement, not compromise each other. Workshops related to human rights stressed the importance of the universality, indivisibility, interdependence and interrelation of all human rights and fundamental freedoms, both online and offline.
- Since its inception, the IGF has proven its value in the cross-cutting area of **Critical Internet Resources** (CIRs) as the IGF community has shepherded discussions and debates about the handling of CIRs. As the IGF has matured, issues related to CIRs are now approached at a more practical level in main sessions and in both technical and non-technical workshops. Discussions have turned to focus more on sharing information and enhancing mutual education; covering a diversity of interest under the CIR banner: top-level domains, internationalised domain names, the exhaustion of IPv4 and the realities of the IPv6 transition, and the role of Internet Exchange Points (IXPs). IGF 2015 also saw discussions about the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) transition addressed at an informative and constructive level.
- The IGF once again served as a **nexus for UN agencies, intergovernmental organizations and major institutions tackling challenges related to Internet public policy**. During the week the UN Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) held an open session on the ten-year review of the progress made in the implementation of the WSIS outcomes; the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) organized a number of events and workshops, including the launch of an Internet Freedom Series Publication and presentation of a Comprehensive Study on the Internet. The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) presented a new 'e>merge' partnership and discussed the implementation of its Connect 2020 Agenda. Open Forums were convened by the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the Council of Europe and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), among many others.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-initiatives>

- **Emerging groups and initiatives** such as the Global Commission on Internet Governance, the NETMundial Initiative and the Global Forum on Cyber Expertise held sessions. The Italian Chamber of Deputies presented an “Internet Bill of Rights”; the “African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedom initiative” was discussed; Stanford University carried out a deliberative poll exercise on the multi-dimensional subject of access; and various emerging and established observatories related to Internet governance shared experiences with a focus on future collaboration.
- **Youth participation** was particularly strong during the 10th IGF. The Youth Coalition on Internet Governance developed an ‘IGF for Newbies’ resource to help assimilate young people with the IGF and Internet governance issues. A programme called Youth@IGF empowered the next generation of leaders and increased the on-site participation of approximately 70 young leaders from Latin America and the Caribbean in debates throughout the IGF.
- **Gender, diversity and intersectionality** were important topics at IGF 2015, with related debates displaying a mature, in-depth way of approaching topics about human rights in diverse contexts, including growing cognisance of existing disparities and inequalities. Internet intermediaries’ roles in protecting, enabling and upholding human rights were also discussed. In the context of the IGF’s intercessional work on *Connecting the Next Billion*, it was also clear that there is no longer a question about whether the Internet is a critical enabler for sustainable development or not. The debate now emphasizes the importance of the quality and type of access, and how such factors impact and enable human rights and sustainable development.
- Other important issues addressed at IGF 2015 included the **Internet of Things, jurisdictional and trade issues, child online protection, the rights of persons with disabilities online, and big data.**
- **The entire IGF 2015 was webcast and interactive online participation enriched sessions throughout the week**, allowing many participants from the developing world to engage with those present in João Pessoa. **Real-time transcription** was also available to augment the overall participatory experience for delegates in the meeting rooms and following around the globe. 50 remote hubs connected participants from countries such as Mexico, Argentina, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Egypt, Iran, Cuba and New Zealand, to name a few. Thousands of interested individuals followed the proceedings on Twitter (#IGF2015), so that virtual discussions took off prior to the start of the meeting, continued between meeting rooms and during breaks throughout the week, and lasted long after delegates left Brazil to return home.

## 10th IGF Outputs and Recommendations:

- ❖ This year’s ‘Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion’ process produced a tangible and community-driven, bottom-up IGF output. The compilation output document and the comprehensive collection of inputs and contributions to the process<sup>6</sup>, available on the IGF website, will be forwarded to other related processes such as the UNGA 2nd Committee through UNDESA, the ITU Council and UNESCO through council meetings, and these agencies will be encouraged to disseminate this information as widely as possible to make public officials aware of the work.

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/policy-options-for-connection-the-next-billion/cnb-outdocs>

- ❖ Outputs<sup>7</sup> from the 2015 Best Practice Forums (BPFs), available on the IGF website, were presented to the community in dedicated sessions and in a main session. The BPFs worked throughout the year to produce diverse outputs which have now become robust resources, with the potential to serve as inputs into other pertinent forums, and can evolve and grow over time on the subjects of: Regulation and Mitigation of Unwanted Communications; Establishing and Supporting Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRTs); Developing Meaningful Multistakeholder Participation Mechanisms; Practices to Counter Online Abuse and Gender-Based Violence Against Women and Girls; Creating an Enabling Environment for IPv6 Adoption and Enabling Environments to Establish Successful IXPs.
- ❖ Participants in the dynamic coalitions session were invited to provide preliminary feedback on the coalitions' output documents, both verbally from the floor and via idea ratings sheets. It was agreed that the documents were "living" documents and that the discussion on them would continue, including through piloted rating sheets online. There was agreement among the DC's that there would be merit in increasing collaboration among the coalitions to develop common procedures.
- ❖ The report from the consultations held at the IGF on WSIS+10 review was forwarded by the co-facilitators of the process to inform the UN General Assembly High-level Meeting on the overall review of the implementation of the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society, taking place on 15-16 December 2015 at UN Headquarters in New York.
- ❖ The Main Session on the NETmundial Statement and the Evolution of the Internet Governance Ecosystem produced a document describing, with examples, the evolution of the Internet governance, at national, regional and international levels, subsequent to the São Paulo meeting, with regard to both (a) the principles for Internet governance that have been defined by the NETmundial Statement and (b) the NETmundial roadmap, as well as places where improvements may be considered.
- ❖ It was recommended during the main session on Internet Economy and Sustainable Development that UN departments and agencies such as UNDESA, ITU, UNESCO and UNCTAD can feed IGF outputs into work towards synchronising WSIS action lines to individual SDGs.
- ❖ The more than 150 thematic workshops and other sessions that took place throughout the week<sup>8</sup> will also produce output reports which will be available to all on the IGF website and can serve as resources and inputs into other relevant processes.
- ❖ National and Regional IGF initiatives were invited to consider putting forward a theme for intercessional work to link substantive activities of these initiatives with the Global IGF, pending the renewal of the IGF mandate.

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/best-practice-forums/draft-2015-bpf-outs>

<sup>8</sup> <http://igf2015.intgovforum.org/>

## Extended Summary:

### Opening Ceremony and Opening Session

UN Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development Lenni Montiel opened the 10th IGF with remarks from UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon, who set the stage for the meeting, stating that:

***“Less than two months ago, world leaders adopted the visionary 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Our challenge now is to implement this blueprint for a better future. Information and communications technologies and the Internet can empower this global undertaking.”***

In a video message Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff declared her support for the IGF’s mandate to be extended in order to enable the sustainable and inclusive development of the Internet. The Brazilian Minister of Communications, André Figueiredo, then assumed the chairmanship of the meeting. In his statement Minister Figueiredo reminded participants that in developing countries, access to the Internet for those still not yet connected to the information society remains the most pressing issue. The statement also emphasized that in Brazil there is full awareness of the importance of Internet access in people’s lives. Virgilio Almeida, coordinator of the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, emphasized in his statement that the Internet of the future must contribute to improving health, the preservation of the environment and other SDGs.

High-level officials during the opening session thanked the Government of Brazil and CGI.br for being the only two-time host of the IGF and praised the overall organization of the meeting and warm hospitality of the local staff.

Speakers throughout the opening session spoke to how Internet governance should evolve and how the International community could address concerns related to increased use of the Internet. Others stressed that ‘permission less innovation’ and openness was vital to the Internet’s future utility. Many agreed that ambitious public and private partnerships are needed to make a real difference for disadvantaged populations. The IGF, with its wide diversity of views and multistakeholder nature, provides the ideal space to develop a response to the challenges that the evolution of the Internet presents.

Indeed, strong statements of support for the renewal of the IGF’s mandate, which will be decided during a meeting of the UNGA on the overall WSIS review in December 2015, were made by several of the speakers. Representatives of governments, including Turkey, the European Commission, the United States, Japan, and China, called for the extension of the IGF mandate, recognizing the invaluable multistakeholder synergy it brings to the discussion on Internet governance.

### Main Sessions<sup>9</sup>

- DAY One •

#### **IGF WSIS+10 Consultations**

---

<sup>9</sup> Full transcripts from all main sessions can be accessed here:  
<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/component/tags/tag/62-igf2015-main-sessions>

The open and multistakeholder WSIS+10 consultation session brought together a diverse and inclusive group of stakeholders on an equal footing, to address and comment on the UNGA's Overall Review of the Implementation of WSIS Outcomes Draft Outcome Document, just released on 4 November 2015.<sup>10</sup>

The presence of the two co-facilitators of the High-Level review process enriched the deliberations and H.E. Mr. Janis Mazeiks, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Latvia and H.E. Mrs. Lana Zaki Nusseibeh, Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates confirmed that a report<sup>11</sup> on the consultations held at the IGF would act as an input into the High-Level review of the UNGA set to take place on 17-18 December.

## • DAY Two •

### **Internet Economy and Sustainable Development**

Participants in this comprehensive main session recommended that deliberations on issues related to the Internet Economy and Sustainable Development coming from the IGF could serve as valuable inputs to the draft WSIS outcome document.

UN agencies such as UNDESA, ITU, UNESCO and UNCTAD can feed IGF discussions into synchronizing WSIS action lines to individual SDGs. It was stressed that Internet and ICTs can support all 17 SDGs and the IGF can contribute to enabling citizens across local economies to better understand the potential of ICTs and Internet access. Other recommendations coming from the session included:

- Creating more awareness about the SDGs, IGF, Multistakeholder mechanisms and how Internet can help achieve SDGs on Regional and National levels, through different stakeholders and Governments.
- Inducing more investment into Internet innovation to serve the SDGs, through both public funds and Venture Capital incentives, among other channels.
- Engaging further local SMEs in localized results serving the SDGs, from local content, to solutions serving different SDGs.
- Improving policies serving access, privacy and security of the Internet.
- Engaging more Women and youth.
- Fostering Internet entrepreneurship.
- Extending the Internet economy to marginalized groups and LDCs.
- Augmenting local content.
- Increase knowledge sharing, capacity building and preparation of youth for future employment.
- Transforming the digital divide into social inclusion.

### **IGF Policy Options and Best Practices for Connecting the Next Billion**

The intercessional work on 'Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion' was presented and discussed during this main session focused on the 2015 intercessional work. More than 80 background contributions were received from the community for the 'Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion'<sup>12</sup> paper including submissions from five Regional IGFs representing most regions of the world (Asia-Pacific IGF, Arab IGF, African IGF, European

---

<sup>10</sup> <http://workspace.unpan.org/sites/Internet/Documents/UNPAN95572.pdf>

<sup>11</sup> The summary report forwarded to the co-facilitators is included herewith on **page 28** of this chair's summary.

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/policy-options-for-connection-the-next-billion/cnb-outdocs>

Dialogue on Internet Governance, Latin American and Caribbean IGF), nine National IGFs, and inputs from Governments, Intergovernmental Organizations, Civil Society, Private Sector and Business Community, Technical Community, Academic Community, IGF Best Practice Forums (BPFs) and Dynamic Coalitions and individual IGF stakeholders. Participants agreed that this compilation document and the full list of background contributions will now serve as a robust resource on this important topic and can also serve as an input into other relevant Internet public policy fora and processes moving forward.

The outputs from the work of the IGF Best Practice Forums were also presented and it was suggested that moving forward BPF work could perhaps be fed into consultations through the National and Regional IGF initiatives. IGF intercessional work, including the BPFs, offer the Internet governance community tangible ways to address pressing Internet policy challenges and issues. Discussions stemming from the BPFs will now inform policy debates taking place in other fora. Delegates stressed that the Best Practice Forum outputs, developed through iterative processes that collect a wide breadth of knowledge from the diverse IGF community, demonstrate the community's efforts to strengthen the IGF, and to build consensus around key issues.

### • DAY Three •

#### **Enhancing Cybersecurity and Building Digital Trust**

Lack of trust in the Internet, a key driver of the global economy, can adversely impact the achievement of the sustainable development goals. Recognizing the crucial need to enhance cybersecurity and build trust, this main session held valuable discussions with stakeholders coming from government, private sector and civil society to give them an opportunity to share their views on the challenges, and provide recommendations for addressing the issues.

The general consensus coming from the session was that cybersecurity is everyone's problem and everyone should be aware and understand that the cyber world is a potential unsafe place. A culture of cybersecurity is needed on different levels. Individual action was encouraged to make the Internet safer. Moreover, a need for a comprehensive approach to tackling cybercrime and building trust, such as the introduction of security elements when developing cyber products and services, was highlighted. Participants also stressed the critical role that education plays in addressing cybercrime issues and noted that education should be expanded to involve all levels of society. Capacity-building was cited as an indispensable driver for cybersecurity.

There were calls for further multistakeholder participation in the tackling of cybercrime. Session panellists agreed that the IGF, including national and regional IGFs, has proven to be a good collaborative multistakeholder process for cybersecurity, but still needs to reach out to get missing parties around the table. The involvement of the government, private sector, civil society and other stakeholders in handling cyber security was stressed as fundamental in terms of sharing best practices, sharing results of critical assessments and identifying globally accepted standards of cybersecurity. All stakeholders must understand, respect and trust each other's expertise and competences.

#### **A Dialogue on 'Zero Rating' and Net Neutrality**

During this session many different views on the business practice of Zero Rating (ZR) were expressed. Zero Rated services provide a mobile broadband subscriber with access to select content, without that access counting against the subscriber's data cap. In the session opening, two questions were posed to the speakers: 1) whether ZR assists in connecting the unconnected by offering Internet access to those who cannot afford it, and 2) whether ZR is a violation of net neutrality when it does not offer access the "full Internet."

The positions that were heard from expert speakers and session participants on ZR were extremely diverse. Some think ZR is a direct violation of Network Neutrality, others don't even think that it is a Network Neutrality issue. The national regulators who participated in the session described completely different approaches to ZR. A third theme that came through was that further research is needed. The discussion also focused on other means to increase Access, such as the use of municipal Wi-Fi and community networks. ZR is only one means of connecting people to the Internet. It was recommended that further research is needed on this complex subject.

The session aired different views of ZR and offered vibrant discussion on the topic. The dynamic input from the audience participants, both in situ and online indicated the importance of holding future sessions dedicated to this and related topics, with more time for input and debate on all aspects and positions. The session was clearly too short to hear all audience contributions that needed to be heard. There was consensus that there is a clear need for more research on ZR, to be undertaken from different viewpoints. Closing the circle to the points presented in the introduction: access, affordability and awareness are important dimensions to consider in policy discussions on ZR.

### **IGF Dynamic Coalitions (Day 3 and Day 4)**

IGF Dynamic coalitions<sup>13</sup> were featured in a main session at the IGF for the first time this year. The MAG decided to dedicate a main session to the coalitions in order to both highlight the groups' reports and open them to consideration as tangible outputs.

Eight coalitions - on Accessibility and Disability (DCAD), on Core Internet Values (DCCIV), on Gender and Internet Governance (DCGIG), on Internet Rights & Principles (IRPC), on Network Neutrality (DCNN), on Platform Responsibility (DCPR), on Public Access in Libraries (DCPAL), and on the Internet of Things (Dicots) - volunteered to present their work in the first segment of the session. These eight were part of an experimental process to solicit feedback from participants via "idea ratings sheets" containing key themes from the coalitions' respective reports. The sheets were used to stimulate debate and discussion during the second segment of the session on the following day. Essential themes or issues presented for feedback included the right to access, gender inclusion in Internet governance processes, support to libraries as public access points, and common definitions of net neutrality. The rating sheets were an innovation of the session and were used for the first time in an IGF setting.

In addition, in the session's second segment, three new dynamic coalitions on Child Online Safety (DCCOS), on Accountability, and on Freedom of Expression Online, had the opportunity to introduce themselves and invite participation in their burgeoning groups.

A suggestion that emerged from the discussions was a proposal to create a DC Coordination Group. This proposal found broad support among the participants. The main task of the proposed group would be to develop a charter for all DCs with common principles and rules of procedure they would agree to adhere to, such as having open lists and open archives. The Group would also look at areas of overlap and duplication and aim to create synergies among the DCs.

---

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/dynamiccoalitions>

## • DAY Four •

### Human Rights on the Internet

Discussions about the importance of human rights on the Internet have grown increasingly prominent at the IGF. The Main Session on Human Rights also reflected a growing recognition that human rights extend beyond enabling access to multiple other dimensions that affect how the Internet enables sustainable development. The Session demonstrated that there are a variety of ways to engage on human rights and that the IGF is becoming an increasingly important platform to discuss these broad issues, what policy actions are needed, and how the IGF community can help to ensure that the Internet is used to enable sustainable development and to promote human rights globally. Topics like hate speech, protecting journalists and citizen journalists to ensure freedom of expression online, preventing the radicalization of youth, the protection and promotion of privacy, and the importance of protecting women's and LGBT communities' rights online and offline by addressing online abuse and gender-based violence were addressed; as were private sector responsibilities in promoting and protecting human rights online. The Session also reflected a more in-depth way of unpacking human rights, how rights apply in a 'real world' context of existing disparity and inequality, the importance of diverse contexts around the world, and how the IGF can also help to ensure that the Internet can help reduce global inequalities and discrimination.

The session focused on three major areas of discussion, namely freedom of expression, privacy and assembly; access, human rights and development; and emerging issues. Discussants from different stakeholder groups provided substantive inputs to some of these pre-defined questions, which were also opened up to participants from the floor for broader conversation. Moderators introduced the overall framing for the session, and actively engaged discussants and participants in the conversation.

In general, the Internet's potential for enabling human rights was stressed in the context of growing Internet access. With reference to other sessions over the week at IGF 2015 some speakers noted that the meeting was characterised by a particular emphasis on certain topics like dangerous and hate speech (including speech targeted at migrants and different ethnic communities; lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender communities; women; and related gender-based violence and abuse); the prevention of radicalizing youth; and the relationship between surveillance and privacy.

### Recommendations and next steps

The session benefited from a rich discussion on a variety of topics, and offered many potential outcomes and recommendations for future work. A selection of these include:

- Discussions about human rights online clearly recognise the particular importance of protecting and promoting privacy, children, minorities, disabled people, and women.
- In the future, there is a need to also investigate how cultural diversity can be balanced with access in the context of promoting human rights, and a related demand for supporting indigenous people's needs in terms of cost, access, and needs where cultural and language preservation are concerned.
- The need to encourage and promote user trust in technology and education on how to use online platforms in ways that do not infringe others' human rights was stressed.
- In the future, it is important that the IGF and other platforms focus on mechanisms for the domestic, regional and international enforcement of human rights and principles; and also refer to and investigate existing legal precedents. The pace of technological change cannot be used as an excuse for inaction, but regulatory responses should be adopted and implemented with caution.

- There is a need to more clearly investigate and define corporate (including platform and intermediary) responsibility for protecting human rights; but state responsibilities should not simply be transferred to the private sector.
- Discussions at the IGF about human rights also need to be reflected and integrated in other regional and international human rights fora.

### **The NETmundial Statement and the Evolution of the Internet Governance Ecosystem**

The NETmundial Multistakeholder Statement covers a wide range of Internet Governance issues that are of great relevance to the IGF. In particular, the Statement highlighted the need for a strengthened IGF in its mandate of serving as the focal point for the discussion of many issues, according to the Tunis Agenda, including some that may not yet be fully addressed in existing organizations, processes and fora.

The session aimed to take stock of the evolution of the Internet Governance ecosystem with regard to the principles and roadmap contained in the NETmundial Multistakeholder Statement. To review the current and future impact of the NETmundial Statement on Internet Governance processes. The session took stock of how those issues are being advanced by the broader Internet governance community 18 months after the São Paulo meeting, by means of concrete examples provided by various players of the ecosystem dealing with different governance issues at national, regional and international levels.

Participants in the open mic session (in person and remotely) raised the following issues:

- There is a need for considering the opinion of people with disabilities in order to implement the provisions of the NETmundial Statement regarding accessibility.
  - *In the context of this manifestation, some leaders of relevant organizations expressed their commitment to inform the OECD about the discussions at IGF.*
- The NETmundial methodology is unequivocally one of the main reasons for its success. That methodology has to be studied and be used to enhance the methodologies applied at the IGF.
  - *Some speakers reacted to this issue by underscoring that strong evidence, good arguments and high quality debate make a lot of difference for societal self-determination.*
- One of the issues that led to the occurrence of the NETmundial Meeting was the issue of mass surveillance. Currently, that topic has not been dealt with satisfactorily.
  - *One expert highlighted that civil society has a key role to occupy in cybersecurity debates and decision-making processes.*
- Child protection is still a matter of concern.
- It is disappointing that there is little or no mention of the NETmundial Meeting in the context of the WSIS+10 process.
  - *Some panelists argued however that different governance processes tend to ignore each other and contended that during the 10th edition of the IGF in 2015 there were several steps to close the bridge between the discussions at the IGF and the WSIS+10 process. They recalled the participants of the efforts of Brazil to bring to the IGF the two co-*

facilitators of the WSIS+10 which resulted in their commitment to take a summary of consultations on the WSIS review to the UNGA.

○ One expert explained that the procedures adopted for the NETmundial meeting are too advanced for many governments to accept. But he was optimistic about a “learning spiral” that guarantees that issues are revisited from time to time which leads to an increased level of understanding at each iteration.

## Key Takeaways and the Way Forward

According to the discussions that took place during the main session and the evidence presented by the speakers, it is possible to affirm that one year and a half after the adoption of the NETmundial Statement, Internet governance has evolved to encompass the following characteristics:

- Human rights and shared values have become a permanent item on the work agenda of Internet technical fora and organizations.
- One thing that was only tangentially mentioned during the discussions that took place in the main session is the growing list of activities and tracks that now form the IG ecosystem. Besides the strengthening of the best practice forums and the dynamic coalitions, the proliferation of national and regional pre-IGF events as documented by the IGF Secretariat (<http://bit.ly/1YuuN5h>) reveals the growing recognition of the distributed, decentralized and multistakeholder nature of the ecosystem.
- More importantly, different methodologies (such as the ones presented in the responses provided for policy question #2) have been developed and can support the evaluation of how advanced or not is the implementation of the NETmundial Principles and Roadmap in the years to come.

The following items consist of takeaways that emerged from the discussions and prospective items that can be considered in the furtherance of the dialogue on the implementation of the NETmundial Principles and Roadmap. In sum, they contribute to the understanding of Internet governance subsequent to the Sao Paulo meeting:

- The NETmundial Statement is still up to date and valuable in all of its recommendations. Besides considering the document as a source of normative guidance for Internet governance, some speakers argued that the NETmundial process has been increasingly invoked as a benchmark for result-oriented Internet governance deliberations (except in intergovernmental arenas as noted elsewhere). Different speakers underscore the strong and solid methodology that guided the process from its inception to its conclusion.
- There was a general sense among the speakers in the session that the IGF has made important improvement to become increasingly more outcome-oriented, which is consistent with the recommendations of the the CSTD Working Group on Improvements to the IGF (available at: <http://www.unctad.info/en/CstdWGI/>) and the NETmundial Meeting.
  - Some speakers highlighted the maturity of IGF discussions and commended the initiative of developing the Youth@IGF program.
- International trade and cybersecurity (and their overlap with Internet governance) are critical areas for the advance of multistakeholder participation.
  - It was recommended that cybersecurity discussions consider development as a fundamental human right.

- There was a general sense among the speakers with regard to the importance of promoting NETmundial principles in all tracks and spheres that form the Internet governance ecosystem. It is necessary however to analyse the meaning of those normative propositions according to the different local and regional contexts.

### **Closing Ceremony**

Ambassador José Antonio Marcondes de Carvalho, Undersecretary for Environment, Energy and Science and Technology, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Brazil, chaired the closing ceremony which featured closing statements from leading representatives from the IGF multistakeholder community. In his remarks, Mr. Ricardo Coutinho, Governor of the State of Paraíba, praised the organizational efforts of Mr. Hartmut Glaser, Executive Secretary of CGI Brazil. Many speakers echoed a message of great thanks to CGI and to the local and host country government officials and supporting staff.

It was said that the IGF by its nature is an inclusive environment, as are the National and Regional IGFs that have emulated in their own circumstances. Speakers urged delegates to leverage that inclusiveness and continue to strive for greater participation, particularly from developing countries, in IGF processes. By doing this it was said that we can help foster an open Internet, that has seen tremendous growth and innovation, provides an engine for economic growth and serves as a platform for expressing ideas, thought and creativity.

Ms. Yolanda Martínez, Head of the Digital Government Unit, Secretariat of Public Administration of Mexico, offered again on behalf of the Government of Mexico to host the 11<sup>th</sup> IGF in 2016, pending the renewal of the IGF mandate.

## 10<sup>th</sup> IGF Session Outputs and Reports

The objective of each annual IGF programme is to maximize the opportunity for open and inclusive dialogue and the exchange of ideas; to try and create feedback loops between the different types of sessions; to create opportunities to share good practices and experiences; to build capacities amongst all stakeholders; and to allow participants both in-person and online to listen, engage in dialogue and learn as well as to identify key themes that could, in the future, benefit from the multi-stakeholder perspective of the IGF. Each year the programming process builds on lessons learned from previous meetings to try and produce the best experience for IGF stakeholders.

The **more than 100 workshops** that took place throughout the week were selected based on evaluations and qualitative scoring conducted by the MAG together with further analysis and selection which strived to provide space for workshops from developing and transitional economy countries and first time workshop organisers and newcomers to the IGF<sup>14</sup>.

**Full reports, with output-oriented analysis and recommendations** coming from all workshop sessions held at the IGF will be uploaded to the IGF website here:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/workshops/list-of-published-workshop-proposals>

**IGF Open Forums** are opportunities for relevant organisations dealing with Internet governance related issues to present and discuss their activities with the broader IGF community in a multistakeholder manner.

The full list of open forums that took place and **reports on these important sessions** can be accessed here: <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/openforums-2015>

**All other session reports** such as reports of meetings of IGF Dynamic Coalitions, Best Practice Forums and other various sessions that took place throughout the week will also be made available on the [IGF website](#).

---

<sup>14</sup> Workshop review and evaluation process: <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/workshops/mag-workshop-review-and-evaluation-process-for-igf-2015>

## 2015 IGF Best Practice Forum (BPF)

### Online Abuse and Gender-Based Violence Against Women

The BPF Online Abuse and Gender-Based Violence Against Women explored the nature and potential definitions of the problem of online abuse and gender-based violence, the various contexts that have an impact on enabling the problem, the diversity of rights that need to be carefully balanced in addressing the problem, and the responses and strategies adopted by public and private sectors, multistakeholder groups, and communities and users to address the problem.

The BPF published a comprehensive [draft](#) document aimed at taking a step towards addressing this multidimensional problem. It also invited input and comment on this document, both via email and at a 90-minute [session](#) at IGF 2015. The session enabled a discussion of not only the BPF's draft findings and recommendations for further exploration, but also the ways in which the problem can continue to be addressed. Panellists included various representatives from intergovernmental organizations, civil society, the technical community and the private sector.

The BPF's work has showed that there is no one-size-fits all solution and that greater study is needed to further investigate the range of acts, underlying causes, diversity and breadth of impact, and potential responses that can be developed for the issue. A few of the BPF's key findings, along with related recommendations for further research, include:

- The problem of online abuse and gender-based violence against women is not only interpreted and approached differently in diverse regions, but the terminology used for it is inconsistent. More work needs to be done to find a comprehensive yet flexible definition of the issue that also addresses specificities in contexts and relevant circumstances.
- In defining and addressing the problem, there is a need to consider, include and balance multiple human rights; and to take into account existing inequalities and discrimination that may affect how rights are protected and recognised. Tensions that arise when issues related to competing rights and interests are involved (including freedom of expression, privacy and anonymity) need further study.
- Efforts to develop, encourage and implement practices to counter the problem vary significantly around the world. The BPF found that it is critical that all responses and approaches to the issue be developed transparently in due consultation with not only current users, but also by taking into consideration the needs of future users as Internet access and adoption expand globally.
- Awareness and literacy programmes are crucial to encourage a better understanding of the problem, along with substantial investment in research and statistics on the incidence of the issue.

The BPF's work has facilitated diverse stakeholder engagement and, as such, benefitted from different views and perspectives. This is, however, only a first step towards a more comprehensive understanding and response. It is hoped that some of the findings and areas for further exploration can inform continued discussion and efforts: both at the IGF as a critical platform for multistakeholder engagement on key internet policy, governance and human rights issues, and in other policy discussion spaces.

# 2015 IGF Best Practices Forum (BPF)

## Enabling Environments to Establish Successful IXPs

### **1. Introduction**

Enabling environments to establish successful IXPs is one of the Best Practice Forums (BPFs) of the 2015 IGF. The BPF on IXPs brings together experts and stakeholders in an open and collaborative process to develop a useful and tangible best practices output. Stakeholder input has been collected via discussions on an open mailing list, regular virtual meetings, public input via the IGF review platform and during the in-person session at the IGF in João Pessoa.

### **2. Purpose of the BPF document**

The BPF best practice document explains why IXPs matter and focus on ways to create enabling environments that allow IXPs to develop and flourish. The information and examples provided are meant to serve as the foundation of a flexible framework, useful regardless of the country or continent, for creating an environment that fosters IXP success and development. In the meantime, this BPF addresses the request from some developing countries for more information about IXPs.

### **3. What are IXPs?**

The Internet is a large network of networks and each network needs to be able to send and receive traffic to any other network. *Internet exchange points (IXPs) are physical locations where Internet networks are connected at a common point to exchange data.* The practice of exchanging data between networks at an IXP is called peering. Peering is in a majority of the IXPs a cost-neutral transaction.

### **4. Benefits of an IXP**

When local networks are exchanging traffic, an IXP can reduce the network's operational costs, keep traffic local and decrease latency, allow better control and more autonomy of a network's own resources, create a more stable and robust local Internet and enable competition by facilitating the entrance of new service providers on the local market.

### **5. Challenges to establish successful IXPs**

Setting up an IXP requires finding peers that agree to set-up and run the IXP, and investing in equipment, training and capacity building. However more than 80% of the success of the IXP depends on its capability to create an environment of trust and cooperation amongst its stakeholders.

Governments and regulators can play a facilitating role by resolving potential legal and regulatory issues that prevent IXPs to develop, provide support at start up, and take their responsibilities to develop the country's infrastructure and a healthy competitive market for national and international connection.

### **6. Next steps**

The BPF IXP outcome document will be published after the IGF meeting. While all countries are different and there is no golden solution, the case studies, references and links to helpful materials enable to establish successful IXPs and are an opportunity to strengthen, amplify, and accelerate Connecting the Next Billion and final billions. Further work can be done on IXPs moving forward by focusing some of the questions that have been raised, for example, what can be done in a land-locked country relying mostly on satellite connectivity, or how to revive a dormant IXP and other problems articulated.

The draft BPF IXP outcome document can be found on the [IGF website](#).

## 2015 IGF Best Practice Forum (BPF)

### Creating an Enabling Environment for IPv6 Adoption

The 2015 BPF on *Creating an Enabling Environment for IPv6 Adoption* (BPF on IPv6 Adoption) was an **open discussion**, with an open participation policy. The **outcome document** is the result of an iterative discussion process conducted on the BPF's open mailing list, over several calls, comments provided by the community at large on the IGF public review platform and the discussions during **the BPF session on IPv6** at the IGF2015. Best practice examples were collected by means of a public survey, through email correspondence, and public mailing list discussions.

**The best practice document intends to assist others in their efforts to support IPv6 adoption in their locality, region, industry, or network.**

Devices connect to the Internet through **Internet Protocol addresses (IP addresses)**, unique numerical addresses. Currently two types of IP addresses co-exist on the Internet: Internet Protocol version 4 (IPv4), developed in the 1970s, and Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6), which offers a much bigger address space to accommodate the growing number of connections to the Internet. Ultimately, the entirety of the Internet should run on IPv6, but during the transitional period between now and then, services offered on and Internet networks themselves need to support both IPv4 and IPv6 at the same time. This dual support is referred to as "dual stack."

The BPF explained **why it is necessary to adopt IPv6 now** to support the continuing rapid expansion of the Internet, both in terms of its technical development (e.g. machine to machine communication) and in bringing more people online. IPv4 is quickly running out of numbers. Existing stopgap measures such as "Network Address Translation" - a technique to share IPv4 addresses across devices and networks - do not provide a long-term solution.

The cost associated with the transition is one of the **hurdles to the adoption of IPv6**. IPv6 needs to be deployed throughout the network by all players and this requires the reconfiguring networks, providing training, upgrading or purchasing new equipment.

The BPF collected and discussed examples of different types of **best practices for creating an enabling environment for IPv6 deployment**, such as IPv6 Task forces and capacity building initiatives. Stories of IPv6 deployment from the private sector were provided, as well as a number of government initiatives.

At the BPF session in João Pessoa case studies were presented on the experiences of the German government administration and the Venezuelan IPv6 Task Force.

The intercessional work on IPv6 and the more tangible outcomes it produced are a great contribution to human and institutional capacity building. This year's work should be continued to focus more on the economic decision making process that sits behind the decision to deploy IPv6. We feel that the potential financial impact of IPv6 adoption is key factor for the decision many businesses and other stakeholders have to make and further studying and documenting these mechanisms could be a great contribution to achieve the goals of the global deployment of IPv6 and, finally, in connecting the next billion users to the Internet.

The final outcome document of the BPF on IPv6 will be published after the IGF meeting. The draft outcome document can be downloaded from [the IGF website](#).

## **2015 IGF Best Practice Forum (BPF)**

### **Establishing and Supporting Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRTs) for Internet Security**

The work of the Best Practices Forum (BPF) on Establishing and Supporting Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRTs) for Internet Security builds on the final report of the 2014 BPF on the same issue. There is consensus that a CSIRT is a “team of experts that responds to computer incidents, coordinates their resolution, notifies its constituents, exchanges information with others and assists constituents with the mitigation of the incident.” One overarching priority emerging from 2014 focused on addressing misconceptions around the role and responsibilities of a CSIRT. A brief investigation showed that the misconceptions are rarely within the CSIRT community, but arise in its interactions with other stakeholders. Among other things, they demand additional tasks from CSIRTs or embed CSIRTs in wider security organisations. This comes with intended or unintended consequences on trust, which could affect the relationship between CSIRTs. Valuable contributions were provided from different perspectives, including civil society, private industry and international organisations.

This BPF showed that the role and involvement of CSIRTs in national security and/or guarding economic interests tends to expand. Change brings the need for direct involvement of CSIRTs in policy discussions and brings the traditional definition of a CSIRT under considerable strain. While the need to cooperate with other involved stakeholders could bring mutual benefits, could, as a downside, have a negative impact on trust within its own community. Trust was seen as an essential element facilitating mutual assistance and information exchange between CSIRTs. While the Forum was able to show several successful examples of expanding roles and new ways of cooperation, some concerns remained. Finally, it was recognised that responsible disclosure by ethical hackers is a topic that deserves further debate.

Participants in this Forum found its work very valuable. One indicator for the level of success is the fact that controversial topics within the CSIRT community are addressed in the BPF, and in some cases altered or successfully brought to other fora such as FIRST and the Global Forum of Cyber Expertise. At the same time, challenging topics were identified as laying ahead, such as security incidents in the cloud, CSIRT maturity, CSIRT metrics, cooperation with LEAs.

On the way forward, it was felt there would be a need to continue the work of this BPF in a form to be determined and a way that would include participation from stakeholders who are currently not involved in the discussions.

## **2015 IGF Best Practice Forum (BPF)**

### **Regulation and Mitigation of Unsolicited Communications**

The 2015 Best Practices Forum (BPF) on the Regulation and Mitigation of Unsolicited Communications built on the work undertaken in 2014. Rather than provide a new set of best practices, the 2015 BPF makes use of established practices by providing examples of where they have been successful so that others are encouraged to consider what may work in their own environments. For the purposes of this BPF, the terms unsolicited communications and spam are analogous, referring to all (written) unsolicited communications (that are carried on the internet), including, and not limited to, messages that spread malware or have other nefarious purposes.

This BPF has the view that the problems that are likely to be encountered by the next billion are most likely very similar to those that have come before. Spam, infections, malware and cybercrime will invariably be prevalent, perhaps more so in developing nations, as measures that have been developed over time to address such issues may not be implemented prior to the broader deployment of broadband connectivity.

This BPF wanted to learn more about the needs and wants of those coming newly online and so solicited input from developing nations, working closely with IGF Africa. Capacity building and training have been flagged as a particular need. In order to give more focus to this issue the BPF organised a matchmaking session on Day 0 of the IGF. The session discussed many of the issues that have been highlighted in the BPF report, and form recommendations. Early signs suggest a willingness from many to collaborate in moving these issues forward.

The draft recommendations cover many topics including, but not limited to, the scope of future BPFs, training, education, the value of botnet mitigation centres, cybercrime reporting, the desirability of further region-specific surveys and the benefits of multistakeholder arrangements both public-private and private-private (examples of which, as mentioned above, are annexed to the Forum's report). The recommendations were, generally speaking, well received and many will be nuanced in response to the productive and candid discussions that resulted.

There was much discussion about the future of this work. In general, this work was found to be valuable and it was acknowledged that in order to facilitate the implementation of the recommendations, there is a need for a regular 'check-in' or review. However, it is a key recommendation of this BPF that there would be more value in expanding the topic to encompass broader cyber security (including cybercrime) and cyber safety issues, as unsolicited communications are only one aspect of the many issues relating to the protection of infrastructure and citizens online.

## 2015 IGF Best Practice Forum (BPF)

### Strengthening Multistakeholder Participation Mechanisms

The 2015 Best Practice Forum (BPF) on Strengthening Multistakeholder Participation Mechanisms output paper<sup>15</sup> reflects the ongoing work of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF) BPF on the same subject. This paper is a working document and builds upon the foundation of work of the 2014 BPF that produced [this output document](#). This paper, developed through an iterative process with active members of this BPF and the broader IGF community, presents both reflective and forward-looking viewpoints on the 2014 exercise from stakeholders participating this year. It also incorporates content and examples received from the call for input to further analyse much of the normative analysis of important issues raised pertaining to strengthening multistakeholder participation mechanisms both during the 2014 work cycle as well as in 2015. Much of the content of this paper is derived also from the group's open mailing list<sup>16</sup>.

The BPF-Multi worked for two years to create this document that explores some of the issues involved in enabling multistakeholder participation. The 2014 work focused on definitions and explored some of the theory behind multistakeholder models. This year, the group documented a number of existing practices and attempted to extract some practices that can be considered when working within a multistakeholder model. Some notable issues encountered and explored in depth in the paper and throughout open discussions during the course of the past year include the nature of consensus in multistakeholder organization and decision making, the 'bad actor' problem, the relationship of multistakeholder models to democracy and both best practices and obstacles to building trust and lowering barriers for participation.

The 'practice descriptions and other input' section at the bottom of the paper compiled input received from the community in response to the aforementioned [call for input](#) at the outset of the 2015 BPF intercessional work cycle. This section also contains some useful and relevant academic articles submitted and collected by members of this BPF for further discussion and use by the IGF community.

Multiple drafts of the document were made available online for public edit leading up to the 10th IGF where the IGF community was asked to consider if the paper could be used as an output document that can be used as an input by other groups involved in developing, or evolving, their own multistakeholder processes. Stakeholders who participated in the 2015 physical meeting<sup>17</sup> of the group at the 10th IGF in João Pessoa supported the initiative to use the paper as an output and to maximize its visibility and usability moving forward. For example, it was recommended that the paper could be forwarded to the regional and national IGFs.

Others in the meeting suggested that the paper could evolve into a 'how-to' guide for developing multistakeholder groups or mechanisms or could evolve into becoming a paper that provides a catalogue of options for group's seeking to use multistakeholder processes. Online trainings or webinars could facilitate disseminating the existing work done and could also help the work evolve, pending the renewal of the IGF and decisions taken by the IGF MAG together with the community.

---

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/best-practice-forums/draft-2015-bpf-outs>

<sup>16</sup> BPF Strengthening Multistakeholder Participation Mechanisms [mailing list](#)

<sup>17</sup> Transcript of the meeting can be found here: <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/187-igf-2015/transcripts-igf-2015/2316-2015-11-10-bpf-developing-meaningful-multistakeholder-participation-mechanism-workshop-room-5>

# IGF Policy Options for Connecting the Next Billion

## - A Synthesis -

### Introduction

More than three billion people will be connected to the Internet by the end of 2015. This is by all standards a great achievement, and the number of Internet users has tripled over the past ten years, but much work is still ahead. Four billion people remain unconnected, which are four billion people unconnected to the vast opportunities for economic and social progress inherent to the Internet. The way forward can learn from the past, and build on the experiences and collaboration amongst all stakeholders, to tackle the challenges ahead. This initiative draws on those experiences and intends to address the issue of connecting the next billions, the last billion, and to address the digital divide.

Based on recommendations from the ECOSOC Working Group on Improvements to the IGF<sup>18</sup>, the initiative is part of a broader effort by the IGF community to produce more tangible outputs to “enhance the impact of the IGF on global Internet governance and policy”. It is also a timely endeavor given the ongoing ten-year review of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS), as well as the newly adopted United Nations Sustainable Development Agenda that recognises ICTs as a crucial component in development, and calls for “universal and affordable access to the Internet in least developed countries by 2020”. The Internet’s potential to improve results in a diverse set of areas, such as healthcare, commerce, agriculture or education, makes it a key enabler for future development and improved living conditions for all people of the world. A report from the Human Rights Council of the United Nations General Assembly<sup>19</sup> also declares access to the Internet a basic human right which enables individuals to “exercise their right to freedom of opinion and expression”.

### A Multistakeholder Approach to Address the Issue

The Internet’s value comes from all those it connects, and the cooperation amongst all stakeholders is imperative to realize its full potential. No single stakeholder can solve the challenge of connecting the remaining parts of the world – it can only be solved through collaboration and partnerships with stakeholders across all segments of society. This is why the multistakeholder nature of the IGF makes it a unique space with the ability to solve complex and cross cutting issues involving all stakeholders.

To share experiences is the first step to find the path forward. By gathering inputs from all stakeholders to identify the obstacles, solutions and strategies to increase connectivity, the initiative makes use of the bottom-up and inclusive approach that is at the core of the IGF process. Rounds of online public consultations have been conducted to carry out this exercise,

---

<sup>18</sup> [http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/a67d65\\_en.pdf](http://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/a67d65_en.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> [http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/17session/A.HRC.17.27\\_en.pdf](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/17session/A.HRC.17.27_en.pdf)

and more than 80 diverse inputs and contributions representing all stakeholders<sup>20</sup>, as well as contributions from National and Regional IGF initiatives, have been submitted to the IGF Secretariat –making it a unique exercise in the history of the IGF.

## **Policy Issues and Options**

The process has been designed to allow for the IGF community to help define the issue, and the contributions and comments received have successfully mapped out the complex and multifaceted nature of increasing connectivity. Different stakeholders have approached the issue from diverse and unique perspectives, which allows for a holistic approach to connectivity which ranges from the deployment of infrastructure to factors that drive demand and enable users to utilize the Internet. To others access is understood from a rights-oriented perspective as the capability to retrieve, produce and distribute information over the Internet. While some inputs have been focused on describing the main obstacles, others have suggested concrete ‘policy options’ for achieving increased connectivity. Together they help shape a useful resource for the community to address the complexity of the challenge ahead.

Below is a summary of the five main dimensions and policy options for increasing connectivity as identified by the IGF community: **1. Deploying infrastructure, 2. Increasing usability, 3. Enabling users, 4. Ensuring affordability and 5. Creating an enabling environment.** Based on this compilation of options, a few possible paths for **the way forward** are also laid out.

### **1. Deploying infrastructure**

The various contributions have identified both “good” and “bad” examples related to the expansion of infrastructure to connect the next billion. The contributions varied from policy suggestions on how to deploy infrastructure, while other contributions were focused on the current challenges in laying out the necessary infrastructure in the developing world.

Much effort has been made in recent years to improve access by deploying both submarine and terrestrial infrastructure. However, many of the contributions identify a need for more investment and public-private cooperation to strengthen national infrastructure backbones in developing countries – and in particular in rural areas. The continued deployment of Internet Exchange Points (IXPs) is another identified priority in order to bring down access costs and stimulate the further development of a local ecosystem. The contributions also highlight the need to transition to IPv6 to ensure long term and sustainable Internet expansion. It is clear from the submissions received that infrastructure development is a key driver for socio-economic growth and access to that infrastructure is paramount to development.

#### **Key areas:**

- Physical Infrastructure
- Broadband, Wi-Fi, Spectrum
- Mobile
- Universal Service Funds
- IXPs/Interconnection Layer

---

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/policy-options-for-connection-the-next-billion/classified-list-of-contributions>

- IPv6

## **2. Increasing usability**

The need to ensure that people are able to use the Internet according to their needs was reflected in many of the contributions. Providing access to the Internet is only the first step – once in place people must be able to use it. Ensuring availability and the ability to use applications, to stimulate the development of local content and services in all languages, and to implement strategies for safeguarding access to people with disabilities were some of the issues identified by the community.

### **Key areas:**

- Applications
- Services
- Local Content/Multilingualism
- Media
- Accessibility

## **3. Enabling Users**

Many of the contributions provided important insights and examples on issues related to enabling individuals online once they have gained access to the Internet. The contributions identified both good practices to improve digital literacy at the National and Regional levels as well as the remaining challenges. At its core is the capability to retrieve, produce and distribute information over the Internet, and many inputs stressed the importance of human rights online, and the need to enable young people, women, the elderly and people with disabilities.

### **Key areas:**

- Human Rights
- Inclusiveness
- User Literacy
- Digital Citizenship
- Entrepreneurship

## **4. Ensuring affordability**

Many of the contributions addressed costs and affordability in developing countries as a critical issue. Cost of access is seen as one of the biggest barriers to getting online, and much of the work currently being done is focused on making Internet access affordable in order to ensure an Internet for all. It's clear that increasing affordable Internet access is essential if countries are to achieve the social development and inclusive knowledge-based economies they desire. Many of the challenges in improving Internet affordability require both innovative policies and methods to make these strategies a reality.

### **Key areas:**

- Digital Divide
- Cost of Access per capita

## 5. Creating enabling Environments

Creating an enabling environment for access and connectivity is highlighted by many of the contributions as an imperative part of bringing more people online. These contributions emphasized the need to create attractive business environments through policies, regulations and legislations, while also taking into consideration existing government policies and institutional environment in developing countries. The contributions offered examples of good practices for such strategies as well as failed attempts for others to learn from.

Many inputs stressed the importance of multistakeholder collaboration to achieve forward-looking connectivity goals and submissions to this process emphasized that future efforts need to ensure that those coming online have access to the entire global, free, and open Internet. Access should be universal, equitable, secure, affordable, and high-quality on the basis of human rights and the rule of law and respect should be given to privacy and the freedom of expression.

### Key areas:

- Government, Regulatory Authorities and IGO Frameworks
- Private Sector led Initiatives
- Non-profit and Other Initiatives

### Conclusion and Recommendations - The Way Forward

This initiative and its outputs constituted a unique exercise in the history of the IGF. As a process it is an attempt to mobilize the inherent benefits of solving complex problems through a diversity of perspectives - each with their own contribution to the solution. It was also a unique opportunity for the IGF community to manifest the benefits of a multistakeholder approach in tackling the challenges ahead, and a chance to show the IGF's ability to produce tangible outputs in an efficient and effective manner.

**Beyond the specificities reflected through the national and regional IGF contributions and others, the IGF community identified some common recommendations for multistakeholder actions moving forward:**

- **In the deployment of infrastructure** much more investment and public-private cooperation is necessary to strengthen national backbones in the developing world, and, in particular, rural populations, and to increase and scale-up cross-border connectivity. Infrastructure development is a key driver for socio-economic growth and access to that infrastructure is paramount to development.
- **To increase usability**, it's important to ensure the availability and the ability for users to use applications, to stimulate the development of local content and services in all languages, and to implement strategies for safeguarding access to people with disabilities.
- Policies that promote the continued creation of locally relevant content should be encouraged, including protections for the freedom of expression, the press, privacy and intellectual property, the development of e-commerce infrastructure, consumer protections, and trusted online payment systems.

- **To enable user's online** emphasis should be placed on the promotion of human rights and the enablement of young people, women and girls, the elderly and persons with disabilities. Access to the Internet is essential for the full realization of human development and facilitates the exercise and enjoyment of a number of human rights and freedoms, including the rights to freedom of expression and access to information, peaceful assembly and association.
- Fostering public access points, as for example in public libraries and community centres among others, and promoting in those spaces digital literacy and local content production activities will also secure better conditions for Internet access and use.
- **To ensure affordability** and address the digital divide, increased efforts and investment are necessary to increase supply and lower the cost of access. Increasing affordable Internet access is essential if countries are to achieve the social developments and inclusive knowledge-based economies they desire.
- Many of the challenges in improving Internet affordability require both innovative policies and methods to make these strategies a reality. There are many well-known benefits to infrastructure sharing, such as lowering industry costs. To encourage this practice and make operators more amenable to sharing, governments can put in place guidelines and regulations to support infrastructure sharing and introduce new business opportunities.
- **In Creating an Enabling Environment** future connectivity efforts need to ensure that those coming online have access to the entire global and open Internet. Access should be universal, equitable, secure, affordable, and high-quality on the basis of human rights and the rule of law and respect should be given to privacy and the freedom of expression.

As the Internet continues to permeate almost all aspects of modern society, the importance of bridging the digital divide increases. The Internet has shown its potential to function as a key enabler for economic and social progress, but it could also exacerbate the economic and social inequalities between those connected and those that are not. This is why the issue of connecting the next billion cannot wait. The current initiative is a step towards reaching the goal, and if successful could be linked to efforts in other fora and inspire new collaborations across the wider community.

The compilation output document, available on the IGF website, was presented and discussed during the 10<sup>th</sup> IGF Main Session on 'Policy Options and Best Practices for Connecting the Next Billion' on 11 November<sup>21</sup>. More than 80 background contributions were received from the community including submissions from 5 Regional IGFs representing most regions of the world (Asia-Pacific IGF, Arab IGF, African IGF, European Dialogue on Internet Governance, Latin

---

<sup>21</sup> Full transcript of the main session can be accessed here: <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/187-igf-2015/transcripts-igf-2015/2339-2015-11-11-igf-intersessional-work-policy-options-and-best-practices-for-connecting-the-next-billion-main-meeting-room>

American and Caribbean IGF), 9 National IGFs, and inputs from Governments, Intergovernmental Organizations, Civil Society, Private Sector and Business Community, Technical Community, Academic Community, IGF Best Practice Forums and Dynamic Coalitions and individual IGF stakeholders. Many of these contributions can be found in full via working [links](#) throughout the compilation document to the respective inputs listed on the IGF website. We hope this compilation document and the full list of background contributions can serve as a robust resource on this important topic and can also serve as an input into other relevant Internet public policy fora and processes moving forward.

## **Tenth Internet Governance Forum, João Pessoa, Brazil**

**10 November, 2015**

**9:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

### **Main Session: “Ten-Year Review of the World Summit on the Information Society: Developing Messages from the IGF Community”**

#### ***Background***

*During the Internet Governance Forum Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) meeting, members of the MAG proposed a special session regarding the WSIS+10 Review. The MAG members endorsed this concept, and an organizing group drawn from different stakeholder communities undertook the development of the main session at the IGF in João Pessoa. With the support and engagement of the MAG Chair, Mr. Janis Karklins, the host country Co-Chair, Mr. Benedicto Fonseca Filho, and Mr. Chengetai Masango of the IGF Secretariat, invitations were extended to the Co-Facilitators and to the Office of the President of the General Assembly from the MAG co-organizers: Ms. Lea Kasper, Ms. Marilyn Cade, Ms. Lynn St. Amour, Mr. Jandyr Ferreria dos Santos Junior, and Ms. Shita Laksmi, who also acted as rapporteur of the session.*

*The co-organizers are from civil society, the private sector, the technical community and government. After extensive online consultation, the co-organizers decided to formulate guiding questions, drawing upon the approach taken by the WSIS Co-Facilitators in the New York consultations. The questions were distributed to participants ahead of time, were also handed out as printed copy in the room, and provided guidance during the 3-hour session, which was co-moderated by Ambassador Fonseca Filho of Brazil and Ms. St Amour from the technical community.*

*Drawing on the NetMundial modalities, the co-organizers provided separate microphones for each stakeholder group. The moderators rotated across these to ensure a balanced set of comments from each group.*

*The presence of the WSIS Co-Facilitators, Ms. Lana Zaki Nusseibeh, Permanent Representative of the United Arab Emirates to the UN, and Mr. Janis Mazeiks, Permanent Representative of Latvia to the UN, as well as of IGF Secretariat staff, was welcomed. The Co-Facilitators delivered opening remarks, with Ms. Zaki Nusseibeh proposing additional guiding questions:*

- 1 - What concrete measures in policy and financing can accelerate the achievement of affordable, relevant, high-quality access in order to bridge the digital divide?*
- 2 - What are the specific measures that can address the gender dimension of the divide?*
- 3 - How do we make sure that our global Internet governance system reflects the global nature of the Internet?*

The following summary of the session addresses the guiding questions and synthesizes the comments received from all stakeholders. The full transcript of the session is also available.

## **SECTION 1 - ICT for development (preamble, sections 1 through 3)**

The guiding questions posed were:

- How can ICTs be harnessed for sustainable development? What insights and experiences from the last 10 years should be highlighted by the review?
- What concrete measures can help bridge the digital divide, including between and within countries, and between women and men?
- How can the IGF community contribute to the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's) and achieving ICT4D for all? What could be the role of the IGF in these efforts?
- How should human rights issues related to ICTs be addressed in the outcome document?
- How should the outcome document handle present and emerging concerns about cybersecurity?

## **COMMENTS**

**There was general support across the stakeholder groups for:**

- The ICT for development paragraphs, for embedding ICTs in development processes, and for the continued focus on Development at the centre of continued WSIS activities.

- Increased focus on relevant policy development processes in the developing and least developed countries to help ensure full equitable participation in all IG processes and forums.

- The strengthened and expanded Human Rights language in the Draft Outcome Document. There was significant support for the recognition that Human Rights obligations apply online just as they do offline, as well as for support for the language on free speech, privacy and surveillance in other paragraphs.

- The linkages drawn between the WSIS activities and the SDG 2030 goals, affirming that ICTs need to be seen as an instrument for achieving all the Sustainable Development Goals, and calling for a regular/periodic review that focuses on the effectiveness of the linkage, highlights Best Practices in meeting the SDGs, while looking for innovative ways to meet those targets.

- Expanding regional, national, and intra-national or sub-national IGF Initiatives given their contributions, their importance to the global IGF, and their role in increasing policy development capacity building.

- Re-balancing the language around multi-stakeholder and multilateral throughout the Outcome Document given the over-emphasis on multilateral and consequent diminishment of the multi-stakeholder model. A broad set of stakeholders felt that the references to multilateral did not reflect reality or historical fact, noting that the multi-stakeholder model has governed much of the Internet's development from the very beginning.

- Further elaborating how to better enable the private sector particularly in the area of capacity building and infrastructure development.

- Looking more broadly at the question of cybersecurity to ensure it fully recognises the role of all stakeholders and spaces beyond the UN in building confidence and security in ICTs.

**Some support for (no comments against):**

- Stronger language that commits governments to increase public services online.
- Para 38; suggest adding references to anonymity and encryption as enablers of rights; include reference to Human Rights covenants or binding instruments in the text (para 5 & 47).
- Adding language to ensure that encryption tools are protected online as they are enablers to the freedom of expression and privacy, noting that blanket prohibitions on encryption violated international Human Rights.
- New financial mechanisms and the idea that there should be a further mechanism separate from usual development assistance.
- The reference to public access in paragraph 27 while looking for stronger language supporting public access as an enabler.

**No consensus:**

- Para 49 – the fact that there was no consensus on the need for a convention on cybercrime, but requests that the language should rather reflect existing consensus on need for cooperation and capacity building.
- There was also call for acknowledging role for non-state actors, who are contributing to addressing cyber security and cybercrime.

**Additional text suggestions but without consensus:**

- Include the notion of technology neutrality at the end of paragraph 15 - the end of the paragraph could read “..now understood to be foundational contributors to enable development and should recognise the principle and importance of technologically neutral solutions.”
- Add SDG # 10 to paragraph number 14: “.9c (infrastructure and access),10 (reduce inequality within and among countries), and....” .
- Add a reference re the Internet as a common good and requirement for free access to basic information in paragraph 21.
- Linkage to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) should be strengthened and make specific reference to SDG 16.10, which aims to “ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements”.

**SECTION 2 - Internet Governance and Enhanced Cooperation**

**The guiding questions posed were:**

- What should the main goals of Internet governance be now and in the future?
- How long should the IGF mandate be? How should improvements be implemented?  
What should be the role of UN?

- What are the respective roles of governments and non-governmental stakeholders? How do you view their fulfilment over the last 10 years and how should they develop in the future?
- How can Enhanced Cooperation across and within the IG ecosystem be strengthened through the WSIS framework?

## **COMMENTS**

### **There was general support across the stakeholder groups for:**

- Including the word multi-stakeholder before the word multilateral in paragraph 50, and adjusting the language around multi-stakeholder vs. multilateral, in order to better represent reality, in terms of who has primarily governed the Internet since the beginning.
- Maintaining the working definition of Internet Governance that is contained in paragraph 34 of the Tunis Agenda.
- The renewal of the IGF mandate, with the consensus opinion of 10 years (though several would have preferred an open ended mandate).
- A request for recognition of the IGF's evolution towards being more outcome oriented, and more focused on capacity building, identifying emerging issues and facilitating institutional dialogue and building on the CSTD Report on Improvements for the IGF.
- Enabling developing countries to participate substantively and equitably in the various forums related to Internet Governance and in the policies which have a direct impact on social and economic development. Text should be added to the Outcome Document stating that funding mechanisms, especially for developing country participation, should be expanded (not only strengthened) to make this a reality.

### **Some support (and no comments against):**

- There are clearly still differences of opinion on what enhanced cooperation means. It was suggested that the WSIS review not focus its attention on long and potentially fruitless discussions about enhanced cooperation in the abstract but instead address it from an issues based perspective: for example: What does enhanced cooperation mean for child online protection, and how do all stakeholders (including governments) play a role?
- The role of the CSTD was recognised and welcomed in discussions about Enhanced Cooperation.
- Paragraph 59 references the UN regional commissions and they could be mobilized again to do this. Another suggestion was the regional IGFs as potentially an effective venue to organize these reviews.

### **Some divergence:**

- Paragraph 51, purports to be established language (paragraph 35 of the Tunis Agenda) yet inserts the text: "within the respective roles and responsibilities" taken from paragraph 50, hence it was recommended that that additional text be deleted as it is not in fact established language.

- With regards to various references on multi-stakeholder vs. multilateral (such as in paragraph 50), or conflated text (such as in paragraph 51), the point was raised that the language should reflect where we are today and all that we have learned through these processes.

- There was a suggestion that where we quote the Tunis Agenda language we include an introduction to place the language in context, so that we are not bound by the status quo of 2005 but we recall where we were and how we got to where we are today.

- There was a request to review the language that was agreed (for the Zero Draft) based on inputs and comments from multiple participants, including several governments, organizations from Civil Society, private sector, technical and academic community. That language did not contradict the agreed language from the Tunis Agenda and better represented both the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders as well as the process that is the basis for Internet Governance today.

- There were significant concerns about paragraph 56 as it seems to imply a state-to-state discussion on enhanced cooperation. It was repeatedly noted that enhanced cooperation involves more than just enabling governments to exercise their power, and that enhanced cooperation already takes place in many settings. Further, a special session of the General Assembly on enhanced cooperation will by its nature be state-to-state and thus not inclusive. The text needs to be clear that government is one of the stakeholders along with many others.

- Paragraph 56, where there is a call for a new intergovernmental Working Group with participation of different stakeholders received comments of non-support, and clarification of why. Statements were made that this is redundant given that the CSTD WG is still constituted. Opening new working groups will take energy from existing efforts and other stakeholder efforts. There was some support to continue the CSTD WG on EC with a new mandate.

- The current text on net neutrality was felt by some to be too constrained, and it was suggested that a statement adopted in the Council of Europe in November 2014 might be more appropriate, it says "take necessary steps to preserve the open and neutral character of the Internet and support end user rights to access, disseminate and use Internet content or services of their choice".

#### **Additional specific text suggestions:**

- Paragraph 50 - the recognition that the Internet is a global resource that should be managed in the public interest was welcomed. It was suggested that the principles of openness and inclusiveness be added as these are key Internet Governance principles, and it would be more consistent with paragraph 12 in the preamble.

### **SECTION 3 - Implementation and Follow-up**

#### **The guiding questions posed were:**

- What financing mechanisms should be put in place to implement WSIS outcomes?
- The review of the implementation of the WSIS outcomes has taken place at 5-year intervals. How often should reviews take place and what should be their nature?
- What role can the IGF and various national and regional IGF Initiatives play in WSIS implementation and follow-up?
- What should be the objectives of the annual reviews: WSIS Action line reviews at the WSIS Forum, and the annual WSIS reports by CSTD?

- How should stakeholders continue to be involved leading up to the UNGA High Level Event in December?

## **COMMENTS**

### **There was some support for (and no comments against):**

- Including a statement in the Follow up and Review section of the Outcome document that ICTs are a very important instrument for achieving the SDGs (given the linkages between the WSIS activities and the SDG 2030 goals).
- An annual review of the linkages between the WSIS activities and the SDG 2030 goals and their effectiveness, highlighting Best Practices, and looking at innovative ways of meeting those goals.
- Regular/periodic regional reviews similar to those in the WSIS process, involving all stakeholders and including reports on progress in achieving the outcomes within the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.
- Using the WSIS Matrix (created by the ITU with the WSIS coordinators) to measure progress and strengthen the impact of ICTs for Sustainable Development.
- Continuing the role of the CSTD and the WSIS Forum, respectively in WSIS review and in Action Line Review.