

**Internet Governance Forum (IGF)**  
**Call for Information – 2014 preparatory cycle**  
**Synthesis Report**

*This report is a synthesis of the information received by the IGF Secretariat in response to the call for information from the Chair of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) of the IGF asking for the community to report on concrete actions and decisions that have been taken by different stakeholders as a result of the engagement and discussions of Internet related issues at the various IGFs (international, regional or national).*

*A complete list of all contributions received can be found on the IGF website here: <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/contributions/call-for-information>*

**Introduction**

1. The Internet Governance Forum was created by the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) as a multistakeholder discussion platform on Internet governance related issues. The primary goals of the IGF are to provide a platform for information exchange, identify emerging challenges and possible solutions to addressing them, provide capacity building, identify and disseminate best practices and forge partnerships for concrete actions.
2. The IGF serves to bring people from various stakeholder groups together on equal footing. Over the years the discussions and deliberations of the global IGF as well as the various National and Regional IGF initiatives have informed and inspired many policy decisions and new initiatives that are shaping the evolving Internet governance landscape today. The IGF has significant power of recognition as it has continuously identified issues that need to be dealt with and have shaped many decisions that have been taken in other fora. Those familiar with the IGF know that it was not designed to necessarily produce binding decisions but rather to inform the decision making processes elsewhere.

3. For this reason during the 2014 preparatory cycle the MAG and the IGF Secretariat decided it would be useful to collect data about concrete actions and decisions that have been taken by different stakeholders as a result of the engagement and discussions of Internet related issues at the various IGFs (international, regional or national).
4. In this respect, a call was made by the MAG Chair to all interested individuals, organizations and institutions that would be willing to share information, on a voluntary basis, about concrete decisions or actions that have been taken as a result of engagement during the current mandate of the IGF (2011-2014).

### **Brief Summary of Contributions Received**

5. Many contributions mentioned that as a result of the IGF, in many countries steps were taken to conduct IGFs at the national and regional levels; for example, Indonesia, Poland and the European Dialogue on Internet Governance (EuroDIG). There are now more than 30 (with more being created year after year) active National and Regional IGFs<sup>1</sup> covering all continents. These important initiatives allow for unique multistakeholder National and Regional discussions to take place on issues particularly relevant to these countries and regions.
6. In addition, examples were given of other various regional and national platforms for dialogue and information exchange that were created for informal and inclusive discussion and exchange on public policy issues related to Internet Governance.
7. Some contributions mentioned that the IGF was a catalyst for the creation of regional and national workshops, meetings and conferences on ideas addressed by the IGF and in general helped to extend various stakeholders' contact networks around the globe. The multistakeholder experience at IGF has also been helpful for the purpose of planning future international conferences such as the NETmundial in Brazil which took place in April 2014.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-initiatives>

8. Contributions from Poland and Indonesia noted that the IGF has contributed to the establishment of special institutions or agencies to promote Internet governance such as the Council for Digitization in Poland and the Indonesia Security Incident Responses Team.
9. A contribution from CENTR on behalf of some members of the ccTLD community said that at the IGF 2010 in Vilnius, the Regional Organizations of ccTLDs (AFTLD, APTLD, CENTR, LACTLD) signed a cooperation agreement that since then has contributed significantly to improve global coordination amongst ccTLDs and their regional organizations. It was also said that each IGF has been instrumental in strengthening the network between ccTLDs on a regional level and has provided excellent opportunities for exchanges between the ccTLD industry, governments and civil society.
10. As a result of experiences at the IGF, the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) in cooperation with ITU and UNICEF, elaborated guidelines for child online protection for industry (online and offline).
11. It was said that as a result of experiences at the IGF, in parts of Latin America Disney has developed school safety curriculums, online materials and editable graphic packs; partnerships of interested stakeholders with education NGOs have been built to distribute online safety information to teachers.
12. The Association for Progressive Communications noted that the IGF had helped various stakeholders to publicize their work and develop guidelines applicable in different spheres such as the 'Public Service Guidelines over the Internet' to be applied by the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) and a 'Code of good practice on information, participation and transparency in Internet governance' - an initiative of the Association for Progressive Communications, the Council of Europe and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. Other stakeholders mentioned that IGF discussions had inspired them to call on governments

to develop guidelines in certain spheres, for example, guidelines for better inclusion of vulnerable groups in the Information Society.

13. The Dynamic Coalition on Network Neutrality commented that the IGF has facilitated progress in the promotion of Network Neutrality. It was submitted that the IGF led to the creation of new internal coordination within EBU broadcasters on the subject. The IGF also helped initiate a process that led to the elaboration of a “model framework”<sup>2</sup> on Network Neutrality that was submitted to the Council of Europe as a working base of a Network Neutrality Recommendation.
14. Latin American and Caribbean ccTLD Regional Organization said that the IGF has been helpful for small regional organizations as it has enhanced knowledge, information sharing and raised awareness of various Internet governance topics and has provided many the opportunity to engage “fluidly with other stakeholders and thus expand the social capital of a small regional organization into a global space”<sup>3</sup>, and helped small regional organizations to become a major players in the Internet Governance landscape.
15. The European Commission emphasized that “the IGF creates a “one-stop shop” by bringing together an extensive range of participants from many communities around the world, including those who do not have opportunities to meet elsewhere”<sup>4</sup>.
16. Further it was noted that the IGF “gives an opportunity for the “right questions” to be asked as it creates a space for frank and open discussions among players with very different ideas, without the pressure to defend positions in a negotiated text and creating an atmosphere where people can better understand the concerns of the others”<sup>5</sup>.

---

2 <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/contributions/call-for-information/183-latin-american-and-caribbean-ccTLD-lactld-regional-organization-response-to-call-for-information-on-concrete-actions-and-decisions-new/file>

3 Id.

4 <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/contributions/call-for-information/180-european-commission-dg-nect-response-to-call-for-information-on-concrete-actions-and-decisions/file>

5 Id.

17. According to the contribution from the European Commission the IGF “provides a platform with the format and agenda which has successfully evolved during the past years to take into account the emergence of new themes and the evolution of Internet governance discussions”<sup>6</sup>.
18. It was also said that the IGF “has been a vehicle for national and European parliamentarians to engage in the debate, giving impetus to inter-parliamentarians contacts and cooperation”<sup>7</sup>.
19. Some stakeholders decided to build and launch new online resources in connection with conclusions drawn from participation in the IGF such as the Global Internet Policy Observatory, an initiative to strengthen existing Internet policy-making processes.
20. Some contributions provided examples of various capacity building programs that were established as an outcome of the IGF, including the South School on Internet Governance that aims to train university and postgraduate students from the Latin America and Caribbean region and from the rest of the world in “understanding the complexity related with Internet Governance and its importance in the future of the Internet”<sup>8</sup>.
21. UNESCO noted that the IGF contributed to the “initiation of a series of farsighted research projects”<sup>9</sup>, and was useful for further research in certain spheres (in particular, research to identify assurance and identity governance), the publication of information books on ICT issues and the production of position papers.
22. It was said that the IGF played a positive role in promoting ‘multistakeholderism’ as a means to test the legitimacy of policy outcomes. “The IGF has been helpful in facilitating the dialogue among community members on how to enhance multistakeholder cooperation, and in stimulating partnerships and initiatives in that regard”<sup>10</sup> (successful

---

6 Id.

7 Id.

8 <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/contributions/call-for-information/186-south-school-on-internet-governance-response-to-call-for-information-on-concrete-actions-and-decisions/file>

9 <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/contributions/call-for-information/193-unesco-response-to-call-for-information-on-concrete-actions-and-decisions/file>

10 Id.

partnerships include the UNESCO-ICANN and UNESCO – EuRID partnerships on promoting Internet multilingualism and the use of IDNs).

23. The Association for Progressive Communications stated that the IGF had played a significant role in bridging the divide between human rights and Internet policy. In particular, it was mentioned that the Freedom Online Coalition “emerged in large part as a result of discussions on human rights on the Internet at the IGF”<sup>11</sup>.
24. Some inputs gave examples of how the IGF has helped to promote new initiatives such as the Dynamic Coalition on Gender Equality, the Dynamic Coalition on Public Access and Libraries, the Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights and Principles and others.
25. Among other positive achievements it was also mentioned that the IGF has helped several stakeholders to consolidate critical sponsor relations which are essential for their core ongoing operations. A representative of the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) stated that measures were taken to support the transition of radios into the Internet world and to defend their interests within the Internet Governance Forum.

---

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/contributions/call-for-information/197-apc-dg-cnect-response-to-call-for-information-on-concrete-actions-and-decisions/file>