

IGF 2016 Workshop Report Template

Session Title	176. Internet Fragmentation: Net neutrality
Date	December 6 th , 2016
Time	9:00
Session Organizer	Federal Telecommunications Institute
Chair/Moderator	Rodrigo de la Parra, Vice-president for Latin America and the Caribbean at ICANN
Rapporteur/Notetaker	Diana Gomez, Federal Telecommunications Institute
List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations	Mario Fromow, Federal Telecommunications Institute Mignon L. Clyburn, Federal Communications Commission Cristina Monti, European Commission William J. Drake, University of Zurich Chinmayi Arun, Centre for Communication Governance Roslyn Leyton, Alberg University
Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The concept and meaning of Internet Fragmentation according with the governmental, industrial, social and academic vision. - The role that plays each stakeholder in order to avoid the fragmentation of Internet - The measures that can be implemented to avoid discriminatory and/or anticompetitive practices among provider of Internet access and content services in order to being able to protect the privacy of communications and security of networks - The costs and the impact of Internet fragmentation on the society - The difference between permanent and temporary and exceptional congestion in terms of net neutrality - The experience of net neutrality rules around the world
If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each Presentation	No presentations were used.
Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session: (3 paragraphs)	Regarding the concept and meaning of Internet fragmentation, it was recognized that there are different concepts regarding the Internet Fragmentation, it was differentiated from the technical fragmentation (developments in the underlying infrastructure that impede the ability of systems), governmental fragmentation (policies and actions that constrain or prevent the use and access to Internet) and the commercial fragmentation (actions and policies that prevent or constrain the exchange of resources and access to information). Considering the above classification of internet fragmentation, it was said that threats of fragmentation may come from government actions, commercial practices or technical conditions, and it was recognized that the challenges to avoid it are global and national. Also, it was highlighted that the Internet works well without strong

	<p>structural oversight by any international or intergovernmental bodies. However, there is a need for more balance of the existing structures in order to increase the legitimacy of current governance arrangements, and to solve and avoid issues like Internet fragmentation. In this regard, the participation of all stakeholders is relevant to avoid the fragmentation. However, it was emphasized that depending on the areas and issues to deal with, is the stakeholder that will work in that issue. For example, the role of the government is to take care of ensuring that the law is enforced and that they protect the public interest</p> <p>Also, it was analyzed the different legal instruments and rules that exist around the world. In this point, a classification of different kind of laws that exist were highlighted: soft rules, hard rules and no rules. In this regard, it was emphasized between the rules that were issued in the United States, in the European Commission, Denmark, the Netherland, and also the project of Mexico. For example, it was shared the experience of the European Legislation on Net Neutrality which introduces a principle of nondiscriminatory traffic management and an individual right to end users to access and distribute Internet content. The United States issued the Open Internet Order in order to protect and promote a platform that supports innovation and commerce while creates incentive for investment and protect the freedom of expression. Finally, it was highlighted that in Mexico, the Federal Telecommunication and Broadcasting Law stipulates that the Internet Service Providers should comply with net neutrality guidelines that the Federal Telecommunications Institute shall issue next year.</p>
<p>Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways: (3 paragraphs)</p>	<p>It is important that the cooperation between stakeholders continue to be inclusive, responsive, effective, and sustainable. Also, it is necessary to know what is the problem of internet fragmentation and define the issues to deal with, before taking any actions, because this could have repercussions on a global level.</p> <p>It is necessary to have more flexibility when it comes to standards and authorities in order to address problems when they arise. So, it is important to know and analyze the impact of Internet fragmentation, considering the development and evolution of technologies.</p> <p>It was highlighted the need of analyze what is happening in markets after net neutrality regulation and what happened with the markets where there is no net neutrality regulation.</p>