

Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

*Synthesis Paper*

*Open Consultations*

*Geneva, February 2012*

## **I. Introduction**

1. This paper summarises comments received in preparation of the sixth IGF<sup>1</sup> meeting, which is to take place during 2012 in Baku, Azerbaijan. This version of the paper takes into account comments received by the IGF Secretariat in response to its call for contributions by 6<sup>th</sup> February 2012. There were 4 contributions received in time of writing this report.
2. This document serves as an input into the Open Consultation on 14th February 2012 and the meeting of the MAG, on 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> February 2012. After the February open consultations and the MAG meeting, a draft of the programme for IGF 2101 will be released for comment- the draft programme paper.
3. All of the contributions and open consultation transcripts will be posted on the IGF Website throughout the preparatory process of the IGF 2012 meeting. The readers of this paper are encouraged to read the original contributions and the open consultations transcripts for further details and in depth discussions.
4. The contributions touched on a great variety of issues. While some commented on the previous year's meeting, others made specific recommendations for the 2012 meeting. There were comments on the themes of the IGF meeting and on the organization of workshops. Several contributions discussed changes in the modalities of the IGF and especially focused on ways in which the IGF could produce.
5. A wide range of comments were made in the submissions about the IGF 2011 meeting in Nairobi, Kenya. The overwhelming sense of these comments was that the meeting was success but that some refinement of certain aspects of the meeting should be considered, for example the scheduling of the feeder workshops and the number of parallel workshops that focused on similar issues.

---

<sup>1</sup> As in previous IGF papers, several often-used acronyms will be used in this paper. The first use in this paper will contain the full name

### III. General comments on the IGF meeting and its functioning

6. Congratulations and gratitude were expressed to the Government of Kenya, UNON, UN DESA and the IGF Secretariat for the preparation and work done in organizing the Sixth IGF meeting.

7. The adaptability of the IGF was noted in the improvements that had been made in 2011 based on comments made in regard to the 2010 IGF meeting.

8. The importance of output messages from the main sessions as well as workshops was recommended by several of the comments. It was also suggested that a diverse set of sources could be used to collate, interpret and analyse the IGF discussions and thereby continue and deepen the debate.

9. It was stressed that continued effort should be made to find ways to report on the capacity building outcomes in a consolidated way.

10. It was recommended that the IGF should continue to encourage organizations co-locating meetings at the IGF to publicize details of their events as early as possible via the IGF website to encourage greater participation in these events, thereby facilitating greater multi-stakeholder cross collaboration.

11. Several comments indicate that the IGF itself should continue to discuss improvements to the IGF in the manner of previous years discussions on Taking Stock of Internet Governance and the Way Forward.

12. The IGF meeting should continue to encourage Regional Hubs and support greater direct participation between them and the IGF sessions in order to allow a bidirectional flow of discussions. However, there is also a challenge for the outcome of the regional meetings to stay local in order to facilitate and produce impact on Governments and policy decisions between stakeholders. Further it was commented a link between Regional IG discussions and the MAG for feedback and information sharing would be useful.

13. The IGF should continue to encourage the MAG to facilitate workshop mergers when multiple workshop proposals contain similar or duplicate content areas and allow the aggregation of diverse workshop submissions into theme-based tracks – but with close coordination with open consultation input.

14. It was also noted that gender report cards should be used along with other metrics to demonstrate the level of multi-stakeholder participation and the inclusiveness of IGF processes.

15. Other comments included the following

- “Feeder” workshops which incorporate all stakeholders should be prioritized
- Main session should all include representatives from all stakeholder groups
- Minimizing time for panellists during main discussions, allowing as much time as possible for open discussion from the floor and from remote participants
- It remains important to provide a “Setting the Scene” session that can help provide a necessary introduction to newcomers to Internet governance discussions.
- Maintain rotation of the IGF venue between regions in order to improve participation and bring new voices to the dialogue.

16. There were some comments relating to the Opening and Closing sessions. While there was recognition of the importance of these sessions, it was also considered important to take into account the need to use the relatively small amount of time available for the IGF meetings

#### **IV. Comments related to IGF themes and issues for IGF 2012**

17. It was recommended that the *cross-cutting theme* of development should remain a key component of the next meeting, one contributor suggesting human rights and the Internet as the main theme. It was also suggested that filtering be part of the main agenda considering both Internet architecture, due legal process and human rights.

18. In terms of the development theme it was argued in several submissions that the focus of the debate to date has been on global issues of Internet governance for development (IG4D) and that it is now important to explore ways to balance the IG4D by addressing development-focused ICT policy issues in general.

19. Other individual suggestions on the development theme include, *inter alia*;

- Continue to encourage workshop proposals that include developing country perspectives. A specific angle of discussion on development concerns/opportunities should be prioritized;
- Facilitate discussions about what developing countries can do to attract private investment in broadband infrastructure deployment, and to encourage innovation and the growth of ICT services, including mobile;
- Have a session focused on the exchange of best practices was seen as potentially very productive;
- Exploring the importance of relevant content for development, which can include local content issues and commercial content services, would be useful for 2012.

20. Several suggestions were made regarding the themes of *Security, Openness and Privacy* that would build on the discussions of previous IGF meetings, including, *inter alia*:

- Internet intermediary liabilities
- Highlight cross-border issues as major components of the privacy and security discussions.
- Developing a clearer sense of the roles, duties, responsibilities and liabilities of government and other actors regarding online security, openness and privacy
- responding to violence against women online

21. One suggestion for the *Access and Diversity* session included discussion on how Internet Exchange Points are reducing the costs for local content. Another topic concerned the Governance issues involved in blocking websites. The whole is of digital migration and the implications for IG need to be discussed and better understandings developed.

22. A theme that linked several areas, but often just associated with Access and Diversity, is that of access to and use of the radio spectrum. One submission argued that this area of spectrum needs far greater attention including new debates on secondary use of spectrum, use of white spaces and dynamics spectrum sensing/use.

23. It was acknowledged that the debate over access was extended in the debates in IGF 2011 to include access to knowledge and it was noted, by several, that further consideration should be given to this theme.

24. Several comments remarked on the success of the *Emerging Issues* session on cloud computing and supported continuing the practice of selecting a new emerging issue as a theme each year. Further suggestions included, network neutrality, mobile Internet and conflict minerals. There was a view that themes should be introduced on new trends and technologies building on the previous discussions regarding cloud and mobile Internet, and their impacts on social development and economic growth, sustainable development and or climate change. It was also suggested that there is a need to encourage discussions which foster a better understanding of the impact of the economic downturn on Internet governance.

25. In terms of *Critical Internet Resources* it was seen by several commentators that further debate is needed around issues such as the institutional structure of IG, including the future of ICANN, IP addressing, root servers and Internet exchange points.

26. Several suggestions were made for the Critical Internet Issues theme, including, *inter alia*;

- Best Practices for eliminating barriers to access to the Internet;
- IPv6 and the impact and opportunities for the developing world that may result from the transition to IPv6 and how does the coming depletion of IPv4 addresses affect developing countries?
- What is the effect of the deployment of multilingual domain names, i.e. IDN.IDN?
- Issues of ICANN's naming policy and the impact of the new gTLDs and IDN gTLDs;
- Technical issues such as DNS blocking and how such technical issues drive or impact policy.

27. Cross border Issues: Many of the most difficult and pressing issues in Internet governance are described as concerning cross-border effects of national laws, policies, enforcement policies, and the actions of intermediaries on those who have no representation in the making of the laws or policies. One submission suggests that a session that investigates formulations to these cross border issues would be important.

## Annex 1:

There a wide range of comments made in the submission about the IGF meeting in 2011. Among the specific aspects singled out for appreciation by the contributors were the following:

- the hospitality of the Kenyan hosts;
- the preparations done by the UN Secretary General, DESA, the IGF Secretariat and the Host Country in preparation for the sixth IGF meeting;
- the Host Country website and the UN in Nairobi (UNON) for resources made available for the meeting, including a very stable IPv6 network;
- a registration process where the staff processed delegates, quickly and efficiently; the 07.30 am start for the registration was seen as particularly helpful to delegates;
- the good layout in the main session room for discussions;
- the improved remote participation, for remote hubs and for remote moderation;
- the, summary reports, webcasts, audio-casts and other records of the IGF meeting to be found on the IGF Web site;
- the continued availability of IGF You Tube site;
- the greater visibility for the activities of national and regional IGFs;
- the accessibility and maintenance of the IGF archives;
- the numerous Electrical outlets around venue;
- the good and relatively stable Wi-Fi connection throughout the event;
- the water fountains throughout the venue;
- the security services throughout the UN centre;
- the location of the IGF village - The booths were of great value to the participants, more emphasis to be put on the village and booth by the host country in its organization for 2012. The village is an excellent networking and information exchange point which is a major value-add of the IGF;
- the way the catering was delivered - lunch provided by the hosts was a good idea and greatly appreciated. The other lunch options, of which there were many, in the food area was very good, quick and easy, and affordable;
- The Gala dinner was a wonderful event and provided a warm atmosphere for participants to interact and network; access was a bit difficult but still an excellent event.

There was some criticism of aspects related to the 2011 meeting, such as:

- Too many workshops on the same theme were held in parallel thereby fragmenting the audience and reducing the opportunities for delegates to participate and learn from the debates;
- There were some difficulties with customs authorities when importing materials for the event - customs agencies should be notified ahead of time by the host country that an event is taking place and that the goods associated with this event should have a different clearance procedure. It was noted that a preferred carrier (such as an international courier company) could make this process easier. Further it was noted that all IGF participants sending materials should receive clear information well in advance about the process and any additional fees;
- There was some concern that the location of the venue vis-à-vis hotels did require additional transport time and costs for many attendees. Proximity of the venue to a range of hotels should be a priority in future meetings of the IGF. In some cases the official buses were running late and therefore a number of delegates had to take

taxis in the morning to arrive in time; for those attending early morning meeting the official buses were not timetabled to run early enough.

- Delegate bags – the process for providing materials for delegates' bags is needed in advance (2-3 months) and clear information about whether or not organizations can insert materials and what the process will be;
- Press list – it is important to have more access to this information in order to build communications and media attention for the IGF;
- Throughout the day more coffee breaks are needed to support networking opportunities
- Registration staff – this seemed to be a new process for the staff, and whilst very friendly and helpful, they seemed in some circumstances to be overwhelmed. Future IGFs should ensure registration staff is well briefed in advance and that there are enough staff to process participants efficiently. It was very helpful to have the registration open starting over the weekend before the IGF, this should be continued;
- There should be better load planning for the power networks and for Internet access, including the wifi network; the peak load often resulted in deterioration of service to unusable levels and there were several power outages;
- Meeting rooms – in many cases it was felt that the rooms allocated for briefings and side meetings were not suitable and there were a lot of last minute changes due to this. Good room planning ahead of time for side meetings allows organizers to keep their members and invited guests informed. IGF venues in the future should have suitable side meeting rooms that are not being used immediately afterwards as workshop rooms to reduce strain on all users;
- Access to printing was very expensive. In the past there have been printing stations for free Future IGFs should ensure more cybercafé computers and free printing for at least smaller print jobs;
- Webcast and remote participation – some remote delegates had difficulty trying to access the workshops and other sessions;
- There was some concern that access to the venue for people with disabilities was short of that expected – this meant some delegates were unable to participate fully in the meeting.

## Annex 2: Comment Sources

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

APC, Association for Progressive Communications
DiploFoundation
ICC BASIS, International Chamber of Commerce, Business Action to Support the Information society
ISOC, Internet Society
NRO, Number Resources Organization