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**Report on the IGF USA 2011**

**See Documentary Coverage of event at:** <http://www.elon.edu/e-web/predictions/igf_usa/igf_usa_2011.xhtml>

and at www.igf-usa.us

**Overview of IGF-USA Mission, Activities, and Focus:**

IGF-USA’s activities, mission and focus were initially launched in 2009 with a bottom up consensus based coordination and planning process guided by a multi stakeholder Steering Group{SG] that agreed to work together informally. This built on activities that had taken place separately in civil society, academia and business, and brought together a broad and diverse set of stakeholders in planning and launching the IGF-USA.

The SG is open to any interested participant who supports the mission and agrees to active engagement in the IGF-USA. It has a stable set of participants, and some who join in an annual basis; some members are very active, and others primarily participate during the annual event and its preparatory processes. Efforts continue to broaden and build civil society, academia, and NGO participation in the SG’s discussions. [SG participants list can be found as an attachment, and bios for the SG are included in the bios of speakers and panelists on the IGF-USA web page].

The SG advises on decisions on coordination, management and plays a critical leadership role in the formulation of the sessions at the IGF-USA and any additional activities conducted during the year by IGF-USA. The Steering Group meets on a frequent basis by conference call/with face to face for those who can travel to meetings. The SG relies on involved participants to guide decisions but tries to incorporate suggestions from all SGs into major decisions. The reporting out from IGF-USA at the IGF is also posted to the SG for their review and comment, via a report. After posting, the Report will still be open to suggested changes by SG members.

**What the IGF-USA Focuses on:**

The IGF-USA’s activities are primarily focused on planning and preparation for the IGF-USA annualevent and participation of the IGF-USA SG members in the IGF itself regarding the IGF-USA. In addition, briefings on related events such as the CSTD Working Group; ECOSOC meetings; UN GA discussion of Internet governance are included in relevant planning sessions as they arise, during the year’s activities and based on SG members expertise or interactions. [[1]](#footnote-2)

**Documenting IGF-USA public events: Imagining the Internet**

Although reports have been provided for each public event, a unique reporting and documentation has been provided by Imagining the Internet, under the leadership of Janna Anderson and with support of her colleague, Colin Donohue, and their students. The reports of Imagining the Internet for IGF-USA can be found  on Imagining the Internet’s website, <http://www.elon.edu/e-web/predictions/igf_usa/default.xhtml>, and at [http://www.igf-usa.us](http://www.igf-usa.us/).

**IGF-USA Primary Focus – awareness of IG and IGF; continuation of the IGF and its role:**

Most of the IGF-USA SG members are engaged in global activities related to Internet Governance (IG) and to the IGF, including its improvements, enhancements, and annual global IGF itself. Internet and online policy on the Internet in the US is well developed and numerous nationally focused NGOs/Civil Society/trade associations/Think Tanks and leading academics and researchers address national policy issues quite robustly. In many cases, strong divisions on national policy exist between different stakeholder groups. Many of those entities do not yet have a focus on the role of IG, or the resources to actively follow and engage in the IGF; while some are and have established strong thought leadership in the IGF consultation processes.

Engaging more now nationally focused entities in IGF-USA activities and work is still a work in progress for IGF-USA, recognizing that much national policy debate does not easily scale, while other discussions about policy issues can be extremely relevant, e.g., cyber security or data access/Internet Intermediary liability, concerns about Human Rights, free flow of information and freedom of expression.

In summary, IGF-USA’s focus is to broaden and deepen awareness of Internet Governance and the role of multi stakeholder involvement, and approaches, overall. We also seek to identify when and how policy perspectives that are national in perspective scale into a global for a, such as the IGF. Activities are focused on planning and conducting an annual event, and directly, onsupporting the IGF, its continuation, and improvements. The IGF-USA also seeks to include awareness and information about activities that *affect* the IGF, such as the CSTD Working Group on Internet Governance, ECOSOC and UN related decisions, awareness of other national/regional initiatives. The future of IG is a specific focus that has emerged in 2010 and 2011.

**Social networking enhancements:**

IGF-USA is examining its use of social media, and a collaboration of one of the SG members and Elon University’s Imagining the Internet and AU is underway, with a goal of promoting IGF-USA participation during the IGF, and leveraging the contributions and commentary from SG members during the IGF.

**Next Steps for IGF-USA@ IGF 2011:**

Originally, IGF-USA requested a separate session for the IGF 2011 to present its activities and focus on its use of scenarios; however, recognizing from the Programme Paper that allocation of sessions was challenged by availability of rooms and with the addition of a Scenario Summit session, IGF-USA itself will participate in two ways, during the IGF:

1) Inter-Regional IGF Roundtable and

2) as a participant/presenter/discussant during the Scenario Summit.

**Additional 2011 Sessions and Events:**

**Sept. 13: Pre IGF Briefing : IGF-USA participation in IGF 2011:**

* As agreed in the SG discussions post IGF-USA annual meeting, the IGF-USA is hosting a pre IGF briefing session highlighting how IGF-USA SG members are participating in the IGF.
* Approximately 20 - 30 participants from the IGF-USA will be participating in the IGF in Nairobi in their individual capacity and as thought leaders in their own areas of expertise in different workshops and sessions.
* Well over 125-135 attendees from the US are registered in the list of registrants for IGF Nairobi.

**During the IGF**: In addition to the Inter regional roundtables on national and regional IGF initiatives, IGF-USA participants attending the IGF will also be encouraged to attend and participate in the two workshops on Improvements to the IGF.

**Following the IGF**, IGF-USA will host a public debrief event from the IGF 2011, and looking forward to planning for activities for 2012.

IGF-USA 2012: The Steering Group and the participants in IGF-USA 2011 committed to organizing some preliminary consultations and an annual event for 2012. Planning for that will begin upon the debrief planned for post IGF Nairobi.

**IGF-USA 2011 Event Report- Georgetown Law Center**

**July 18, 2011**

This Report is a summary of the sessions, workshops, and Scenarios that made up the annual IGF-USA 2011 event, held on July 18, 2011. It includes detailed summaries of workshops, main sessions, and best practice forums, as well as a section that summarizes planning methodology, financial approach, list of Steering Group members, Sponsors for 2011, and Interns.

The IGF USA largely follows the format and themes that are part of the global IGF, but the Steering Group customizes the program to fit the unique perspective of the IGF-USA. IGF-USA 2011 was a one day event, hosted at the Georgetown Law Center, Washington, DC. The plenaries were webcast, and all sessions were also reported by Imagining the Internet.

**Imagining the Internet’s Video/Written Reports:**

IGF-USA has a unique relationship with Imagining the Internet that provides additional reporting and coverage of all sessions. Janna Anderson, Elon University, is a member of the SG, and in addition to her contributions in that role, along with her colleague, Colin Donohue, and with the participation of their students, haveestablished a unique approach to reporting about the IGF-USA, which has contributed extensively to the information available about the IGF-USA events for 2009, 2010 and 2011.

This reporting can be found at http://www.elon.edu/e-web/predictions/igf\_usa/igf\_usa\_2011] and linked to from the [www.igf-usa.us](http://www.igf-usa.us).

**When and Where:**

The IGF-USA 2011 was held on July 18, 2011, at the Georgetown Law Center. The Agenda for the 2011 session can be found at [www.igf-usa.us](http://www.igf-usa.us); along with bios for the panelists, moderators, IGF-USA 2011 Steering Group and Interns.

**Opening Plenary Session:**

Link to:<http://www.elon.edu/e-web/predictions/igf_usa/igf_usa_2011_opening_plenary.xhtml>

Following opening comments from Marilyn Cade, Chief Catalyst/Coordinator of IGF-USA, Pablo Molina, Campus CIO and AVP of Georgetown University welcomed IGF-USA 2011 for its second annual event of the IGF-USA. Molina’s address focused on the importance of Internet governance in protecting the innovation of the Internet. He reminded all of the powerful influence the Internet has in contributing to and sustaining the economy, education, and health of our nation, and the world. He also invoked the importance of the Internet in developing countries, and how the decisions and leadership of key players can influence Internet and Internet governance decisions that affect the billions of world citizens.

Following Molina, the IGF Secretariat, Chengetai Masango, shared with the audience how the bottom-up structure of the global IGF works and how beneficial the regional and national IGFs are to the IGF. He thanked the IGF-USA for introducing the use of scenarios – noting that this September in Nairobi, a ‘Scenario Summit’ will examine the role of scenarios in IG – clearly driven from an innovation that stemmed from a national IGF. In conclusion, his comments noted that the collaboration of all stakeholders, on a global basis in the IGF, but also in the national and regional initiatives can support contributions to development and growth to all.

Ambassador Phil Verveer, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Coordinator of International Communications & Information Policy provided the Plenary keynote. [<http://www.state.gov/e/eeb/rls/rm/2011/170221.htm> ]

Ambassador Verveer focused on the value of the multi-stakeholder model for the Internet which allows “open and free” participation for all. He further reiterated this by citing examples of organizations that support such cooperative models such as the Internet Governance Forum and contrasted other examples, such as standards bodies that oppose it, such as the ITU.

Ambassador Verveer’s comments supported the benefits of spreading the Internet to underdeveloped countries, specifically when it comes to the region of Africa. He recognized the United States Telecommunications Training Institute’s part in this development – noting the many private sector supporters to USTTI and thanking Ambassador Mickey Gardner for his leadership. Finally, Verveer concluded by saying he looked forward to seeing many in Nairobi at the IGF.

The next speaker was introduced by Janna Anderson, Elon University noting his thought leadership and welcoming him back to IGF-USA to address key trends and perspectives on the social impact of the Internet in American life.

 Lee Rainie, Director of the Pew Research Center’s Internet & American Life Project, a non-profit, non–partisan “fact tank” that studies the social impact of the Internet, focused on a unique aspect emerging from his recent research:

 “I’m Ok, They’re Not: Trying to unravel what Internet users want when it comes to governing the Internet” [[http://pewInternet.org/Presentations/2011/Jul/Internet-Governance-Forum.aspx](http://pewinternet.org/Presentations/2011/Jul/Internet-Governance-Forum.aspx)]

In his remarks, Rainie gave a thorough overview of US Internet user statistics citing “no drastic changes within the past two or three years in areas such as e-commerce, at home broadband use, and user data in general”, but asserting the steady growth of mobile Internet use and social networking. He centralized his remarks on two subsets: user behavior and user attitudes. He introduced the concept of an “I’m Ok, They’re Not” syndrome of Internet users. As individuals, Internet users are satisfied about what they get out of the Internet ***but*** have concerns about how the use of the Internet by ***others*** has influence on them.

Overall, his research shows that Internet users’ views in terms of Internet governance are that they want to continue to have all of the freedom they have because of the enjoyment they get from the wide range of activities available through the Internet for them in their lives. But, they often accept limitations in ‘others’ freedoms, at least, in theory.

He summed up with the point that Internet users want it all: “liberty and security,” “transparency and confidentiality,” “free expression and a climate of civility”. Rainie noted that our challenge isto work through these paradoxes to find the best path.

**This section provides summaries from each of the workshops and best practice sessions:**

**Workshop:**

***“Can the Clouds prevail? Data Retention; Privacy; Security; Geo-location; Mobility; Government/Law Enforcement Cooperation; Transnational Location Issues: Emerging Challenges in Internet Governance[[2]](#footnote-3)”***

*Promoted by industry and government alike, the “Cloud” seems to be the answer to next stage online services—addressing costs; access; diversity of infrastructure; reliability; and security. Yet its very distributed nature raises Internet governance questions—this workshop addressed the Internet Governance questions facing Cloud computing – and various stakeholders’ views on addressing them, including the emergence of mobile “Cloud”.*

The Cloud workshop at the 2011 IGF-USA, organized by Dan O’Neill, GIIC, substantiated the continued importance of this issue both for IGF-USA and for the IGF. Primary issues raised and debated in the session were: privacy and its relationship with greater innovation; cross border data flow and the challenges this poses for governments and business; International standards for the cloud; and access and security for law enforcement.

Moderator Mike Nelson, Georgetown University, led a spirited exchange between the multi-stakeholder panel and audience on all of these issues.

There was also a strong sentiment from the audience to have a greater focus on the opportunities afforded by the cloud, not just the challenges so as not to misrepresent the tremendous potential in the cloud. Panelists agreed, responding that a focus on challenges does not negate the tremendous opportunities of cloud, instead it reflects a desire to overcome the obstacles of the cloud to ensure full utilization of this technology.

Nelson suggested towards the end of the workshop that it is clear cloud has a tremendous multiplier effect on all of the issues raised – the benefits are vastly greater with the cloud; but so are the challenges that need to be addressed.

Finally, there was a consensus that the United States stakeholders must assume a leadership role on cloud issues domestically as well as continue to take leadership on these same issues on the multiple global fora.

**Workshop: Challenges to CRITICAL INTERNET RESOURCES Blocking and Tackling: New Risks and Solutions?[[3]](#footnote-4)**

*The Internet’s visibility as a critical communications mechanism has drawn increased attention from policy makers, the technical community, and Internet users in general. Thus, security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet are recognized as priorities to the continued successful growth of the Internet as a platform for worldwide communication, commerce, and innovation. Threats to these core elements of the Internet are already taking many forms and are increasing in scope and sophistication. On the other hand, new policy initiatives and technical solutions provide possible avenues to address the threats.*

This panel, organized by Jim Galvin, Afilias, combined two challenges that are engendering varying views concerning their efficacy with respect to the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet: DNS blocking and filtering, and IPv6. Organizers and expert panelists are active in both national and global for a addressing these challenges; the workshop explored the range of emerging threats to the Internet and the sometimes-competing considerations in the use of DNS-based solutions to these threats and the implementation of the new addressing system – IPV6.

The program presented a balanced view of the relevant issues. It included participants from the government, intellectual property, Internet operations, and public interest communities. This session was highly interactive and included audience interaction and participation with the expert participants.

*Observations from Moderator on Experience/Outcomes of the Workshop/Panelist comments/Audience Reaction are still to be added.*

**Workshop: A Plethora of Internet-related Policy Principles: OECD; US Cyber Security; G8 and Others[[4]](#footnote-5)**

Originally a Cyber-Security workshop was planned in this time slot. However, as time got closer to the event, discussions within the SG planning sessions highlighted the growing focus on principles, and the SG accepted the Chief Catalyst’s proposal that there was a greater need to discuss some of the emerging principles on the Internet. The workshop organization was a testament to the commitment of the coordintoring team. A coordinating team of Iren Borissova, Verisign, Leslie Martinkovics, Verizon, Chris Hemmerlein, DoC/NTIA, Heather Shaw, USCIB, and Marilyn Cade, Chief Catalyst/IGF-USA collaborated on finalizing the format and approach, including recruiting speakers.

This workshop included an overview of several sets of principles, including OECD’s recently announced Communiqué on principles, statements by the G8 leaders about the Internet that have implications for action by the G8 countries; the U.S. International Strategy for Cyber space; Council of Europe’s (CoE) Internet Governance Principles; and principles developed by the Brazilian Steering Group and proposed for the Internet Governance Forum to endorse.  After a preliminary briefing on these sets of principles, a compare and contrast presentation that provided a ‘side by side of commonalities and differences.

The session then moved into a Roundtable,with invited respondents interacting with the presenters and each other to discuss and dissect the applicability of these principles to Internet Governance overall, and to consider how principles are then implemented – soft law; hard law; treaty, or “something else”. The discussion focused on the importance of the multi-stakeholder model of Internet Governance. The issue of “principles” versus government-to-government agreements and the efficacy of each in mandating industry and citizen action was a main focus of the discussion. Because the Internet and online services are global, the perspective of the workshop will be ‘taking a global view’ in the discussions that follow these presentations and briefings.

Discussants agreed that even the selected small group of organizations (CoE, OECD, G8) and two national governments (the US and Brazil) have approached the issue of Internet related principles from a somewhat different perspectives, demonstrating different understanding of priorities that can also leads to different outcomes. It is clear that if entities representing mainly the views of developed Western democracies cannot reach an effective consensus among themselves on the one hand, and among their various stakeholder groups on the other, a global consensus can be even more elusive. In this context, it is indeed much easier to reach consensus around non-binding principles.

Workshop participants were unanimous in their opposition to a more traditional inter-governmental mechanism for a global regulatory framework for the Internet. Given the sheer number of governments in the world and the widely varied approaches these governments take on matters related to some of the core principles discussed during the workshop (human rights, (cyber)security, economic development, forms of governance, technology and innovation), participants concluded that soft norms and guiding principles that can garner widespread support by the various stakeholders participating in the Internet governance process globally will be much more effective in guiding individual and collective behavior over the global Internet than any kind of legally binding rules.

The participants concluded that international treaties for the Internet are not needed and they can be counterproductive in that consensus often imparts a bias towards lowest-common-denominator; participants and panelists alike agreed that such traditional treaty approaches also jeopardize the further development of the multi-stakeholder model.

The workshop concluded that “soft law” approach is the only approach that can allow for the development of a global conceptual framework for the governance of the Internet without sacrificing the multi-stakeholder model. In general, participants agreed that the mutistakeholder model is of key importance for a continued Internet-enabled growth and diversity.

The workshop focused on only five sets of Internet related principles, and some participants noted that it is important to recognize that there is already a truly global plethora of principles comprising a number of regional and national sets of such principles. While national laws regarding the Internet can be problematic if they create a patchwork of regulation that hinders local and global Internet growth, national and regional initiatives to devise a set of guiding principles seem to be a good starting point for a process that could eventually lead to a more global set of principles for the global Internet.

The overall outcome of the workshop was a general concurrence that the global IGF seems to be the right venue to consider a more comprehensive global discussion and overview of all currently existing Internet related principles. There was not agreement on approach to this, but the SG had earlier proposed that the IGF-USA may look to develop a collaborative workshop or main session for IGF2012.

**Workshop: Changing Landscape of the domain name System: new gTLDs and their implications for users: Opportunities and Risks[[5]](#footnote-6)**

*In the world outside of Internet governance and ICANN, its not well known fact that a dramatic change to the domain naming system is coming. . In fact we can likely expect dozens to hundreds of new top-level-domain names in late 2012 through 2015. Though ICANN and the Internet community posit that “(t)he expansion of the generic top-level domain (gTLD) space will allow for a greater degree of innovation and choice,” the real impact upon the web, search, and the Internet’s users is truly unknown.*

This session is intended to explore Internet USERS’ experience when the Domain Name System (DNS) undergoes the proposed swift and massive expansion. It's a chance for the community to explore expected changes and how they impact Internet use including communication, research, commerce and other emerging functions. Experts representing the broadest swath of the Internet DNS community including government, contracted parties, users and businesses that represent some of the most trafficked sites online will examine the challenges facing users.

*Observations from Moderator on Experience/Outcomes of the Workshop/Panelist comments/Audience Reaction to be added:*

**BEST PRACTICE FORUMS:**

**Digital Natives: Myth-busting about Youth in the Online World[[6]](#footnote-7)**

At each IGF, the participation of young people has been encouraged. This Best Practice Forum was organized and led by a group of university students from Georgetown and Cornell University. This forum provided some new perspectives that significantly enhanced understanding of youth perspectives.

Objective:To uncover or legitimize myths behind youth and their relationship with the Internet.

Focus: Privacy, especially in its relation with social media.

Background:

Over 90 percent of people ages 12 to 29 in the United States are online. Internet governance debates and Internet policy decisions are often tied to best guarding or guiding young people, but research by respected experts has shown that there are many half-truths and false impressions being tied to the generation that some people have labeled as “digital natives.”

Among these are statements such as: “Young people are addicted to social media,” “Youth do not care about privacy,” “The Internet is a dangerous, dangerous place,” “Teens are naturally tech-savvy and adept at creating online content,” “The virtual world of online communication is isolating young people.”

How do young people really use the Internet? What are the true impacts and likely implications of their evolving uses of online tools? What issues of the digital age are today’s young people most concerned about, and how can decisions about the political, economic and social future of the Internet through governance processes best address these concerns in the future?

The roundtable brought together 8 college-age participants who engaged in a peer-moderated guided discussion and interaction with forum attendees. It primarily focused on myths behind privacy concerns and social media platforms.

Content of Discussion:

* Following the input from participants, the workshop focused on a comprehensive discussion of youth and privacy. Tackling the claim that youth do not care about their privacy online, the participants offered a mix of insights. On the one hand, they agreed that young people do care about privacy, but they have different perceptions about what is private and what is not.
* The roundtable participants agreed that young people are generally aware that anything posted in spaces available to semi-public groups of people (e.g. social networks) could be exposing and effect one’s reputation. They argued that young people are balancing their value of privacy and the value they derive from public exposure.
* The participants also described an array of practices and cues employed by the young people when they manage their online relationships, particularly when it comes to adding new people on social networking websites like Facebook. The overall sentiment was that the young people are rather sophisticated in their online behavior, just as they are in the offline world.
* The participants did voice concerns about content that is perceived as technically protected (e.g. email accounts etc.), where they have little control on guarding their personal information. They referred to the sense of vulnerability, when it comes to questions of Internet security, specifically hackers. The youth participants alluded to the need for additional education in schools to help protect this aspect of their Internet use.
* The message coming out of the roundtable is that young people care about their privacy and employ a range of cues and practices to manage it where they can, particularly when it involved social interactions online. Yet, there are areas, lying more in the realm of security, where the roundtable participants felt more education is needed. These are the areas where young people feel they have no control over the technical aspects of protecting their privacy.

**Best Practice Forum: ICTs for Disaster Response: How the Internet is transforming Emergency Management[[7]](#footnote-8)**

*Recent man-made and natural disasters around the globe have highlighted the importance of ICTs for connecting public safety officials, coordinating response operations, and keeping citizens informed. Additionally, new and emerging Internet-based tools, mobile applications and social media have transformed disaster relief efforts, empowering citizens to access and share life-saving information and locate loved ones. Enhanced media coverage via multiple platforms offers almost instantaneous and ubiquitous coverage about implications for life and property; individuals impacted by natural or man-made risks and threats are able to use social networks, and the Internet, to interactively report on their experiences. The corresponding increase in media reporting and citizen reporting are raising the profile of the impact of disasters – but also transforming disaster response and management. Responders are driving innovative uses of ICTs to transform emergency planning, intermediation, and management. The Internet and social networking are being harnessed by search and rescue teams to locate and bring vital support to victims. ICTs are reassuring loved ones, bringing help to the stranded, raising financial aid, managing communications for responders, and supporting rebuilding.*

This workshop explored the role communications, Internet and Internet-based applications play in disaster response and recovery operations and steps that are taken to ensure continuity of

There was active participation of all panelists and meeting participants group with a few key themes emerging:

* ICTs are integral to disaster management. This is a reality. Governments, private sector entities, NGO’s, and citizens turn immediately to ICTs to collect and communicate information to save lives and coordinate relief efforts. Takeaways from the Workshop related to technology are: (1) there have been recent improvements in making infrastructure more disaster resilient, but more work is needed, especially in developing countries whose infrastructure is less able to withstand a catastrophic disaster; (2) disaster response technologies do not need to be leading edge – people should use what they know; (3) interoperability, networks and network capacity considerations are important to ensure communications flows; (4) new tools (such as mapping tools, streaming video, smart phones) are demanding increased bandwidth.
* Information Management. One of the most important assets in managing any disaster response or recovery effort is ‘information’. The benefit of the Internet and Internet-based tools and mobile applications is that they provide real-time information essential for government responders, relief workers and citizens. Thanks to new Internet tools, the information is there - however, the new challenge is accessing the information and managing this influx of data across multiple information flows. Much of the discussion was about how to aggregate and validate data from various sources, including from citizens, and ensure they are sent to whoever needs it the most. New tools and methods will continue to evolve to help make critical information more usable and accessible.
* Disaster response is multi-stakeholder. Panelists and attendees came from across the public, private and NGO communities, each with their own role in aiding disaster response. In the event of a disaster, each of these must come together to exchange information and facilitate a response. Governments cannot – and do not – address disasters alone.
* Preparedness. Preparedness. Preparedness. Advance planning is critical for saving lives. This cuts across all of disaster response, with ICT playing a role in almost every area of disaster response management. Pre-positioning ICT equipment, planning for excess capacity via the cloud, training of personnel, or educating citizens on alerting tools and escape plans – all are best implemented when planned in advance. The discussion extended internationally, noting the need for advance planning, collaboration and relationship building regionally and globally to ensure an effective response in a time of disaster.

Conclusion:

This is the first time that Disaster Management was included in the IGF-USA. The discussion was both specialized about disaster response, but as the workshop was focused on an application of Internet technologies, the discussion touched upon issues covered in almost every other IGF-USA panel or workshop – infrastructure and access, social media, cloud computing, mobility, and security – and how they impact the disaster response community, governments and citizens. As Internet tools are developed and innovated, as information is more easily collected and shared across multiple stakeholders, and as more lessons learned are collected from recent or future disasters, this topic will only become more important in the future.

***SCENARIOS- The Future of Internet Governance:***

***Background: Scenarios offer a way to look at possible futures, driven by trends. Scenarios are essentially stories about a future, not a prediction, and the purpose of the working discussion is to ask participants to discuss, analyze, determine feasibility, likelihood, or risk of such a future for the Internet and to comment on how to affect, redirect, or embrace such a future. Pioneered by Dutch Shell, but now adopted and adapted into corporate, governmental and NGO planning scenarios are being used in creative ways.***

***In 2010, IGF-USA pioneered the use of scenarios in discussing the future of Internet governance. IGF-USA 2011 elaborated on its inaugural work in 2010 Scenarios by adding new trends, but keeping our basic format and approach.***

***Focus for 2011:***

***Addressing a future affected by man-made and natural challenges and disasters- wars, civil strife, natural disasters, an aging world, and interventionist governments - What is the governance future for the Internet in 2025? Three scenarios were developed and explored; posted to the website, and summarized for participants to debate and discuss. A brief overview of the detailed scenarios [available at*** [***www.igf-usa.us***](http://www.igf-usa.us)***] are provided in the report, with summaries of the comments during the workshop sessions. Attendance in the scenario sessions were purposely restricted in attendance, with Scenario teams who examined a particular scenario and its possibilities, and implications for Internet‘s future and the future for Internet Governance.[[8]](#footnote-9)Thescenarioswerethenboughtintotheplenary, so that all paticipantscouldaddtheirperspectives and comments.***

***Scenario One: Regionalization of the Internet:***

*Much sooner than most of us would have thought (or might have wanted), the regionalization of the Internet has become our new reality. How can we address the unique challenges of a world increasingly broken up into country specific, regional and private corporate intranets and sub-groups? What governing tools and principles will guide us through this digital archipelago? In an increasingly fragmented world, beset by economic concerns, the inclination of governments to respond with government action to risks and threats, natural and human-caused disasters, what will happen to the concept of the unitary Internet and global governance?*

*Regionalization of the Internet is here. More and more governments are choosing to “opt out” of the global Internet system in order to control the flow of information, while new technology like iPv6 and social media are increasingly being adopted by governments to control and monitor their citizens. In the scenario, major political changes – combined with the impact of natural disasters and internal economic pressures – serve to increase this segmentation of the web. Cyber criminal states grow up along with calls for heightened security and trade barriers to protect jobs. The once open highway of digital commerce and communication is now littered with toll roads, surveillance monitoring and a seemingly endless series of cul-de-sacs many of which are filled with thieves. Outside of governments only wealthy companies and individuals are able to afford both protection and the most cherished of all commodities, privacy.*

Scenario Discussions and Audience Reactions:

* The audience agreed that in part, regionalization of the Internet is already underway
* There was agreement that natural and man-made disasters were having an impact, especially on the relationship between users and governments, but these factors will only serve to speed up a process that has already begun – one where governments will be almost certainly unable to address citizens’ needs and desires for security and privacy
* All efforts to protect citizens behind “walled gardens” will certainly fail, as will most efforts to completely isolate or control all but the smallest regional groups
* While everyone agreed on the value and importance of maintaining a free, open and unitary net, it was unclear who would champion this effort – and very clear that many repressive governments, criminal enterprises and others would be working hard to undermine efforts to maintain the status quo

**Scenario Two: Youth: Rising and Reigning**

*At the start if the second decade of the new millennium, the global economy continued to stagger through recession, job loss, and massive government debt.  Slumping national economies strained international organizations as fractures emerged within the EU.  Governments were forced to face the stark realities of spending priorities and investments in social welfare were challenged for the first time in generations. The Arab Spring, the protests of the disenfranchised in European countries like Greece and Spain, and other social unrest movements powered by Internet technologies changed the world. Young people increasingly became the power producers and consumers of Internet content.*

*Climate change remained a central focus. Altered weather patterns brought additional disasters to new parts of the globe, e.g. the Japan’s Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster, exposing historically safe coastal regions to the destructive forces of nature. Internet technologies helped save millions of lives. Together with video, social networks revealed the successes and failures of relief efforts and allowed organizations to nimbly navigate roadblocks to aid delivery.*

*In addition to disaster mitigation, the growth of social networking changed the way people maintain relationships in their everyday lives. The extensive amount of content and personal data volunteered by individuals for their online profiles raised privacy concerns.*

*The Wikileaks case, the News of the World scandal, and the financial success of the Huffington Post, led consumers to question the value of traditional journalism. Content producers and consumers increasingly turned to alternative methods and media to media and share news. Traditional newspapers wrestled with declining readership numbers and advertising revenues. Young, ambitious reporters increased their influence in the online world.*

*Young people became politically more active and organized. Many joined the Pirate party, the Internet party and other technology-concerned political movements.*

*Drivers for this scenario:*

*Three converging forces*

1. *The global economy continued to stagger through recession, job loss, and massive government debt.*
2. *Pandemics, civil strife and natural disasters affecting some parts of the world continued.*
3. *Internet technologies were increasingly simpler and more affordable.*

*The Internet in 2025*

* *Governments and businesses require biometric identification for online users.*
* *You need an “Online License” to use the Internet.*
* *Citizen journalism becomes the mainstream media for the production and consumption of news and entertainment.*

Scenario Discussions and Audience Reactions:

* Multi-stake holder representation in matters of Internet governance is critical. This is our Internet, not just the Internet of governments and corporations. Engaging more citizens to participate and ensuring appropriate representation, both individually and through civil society organizations, is critical to the process.
* Weaving technology in primary, secondary and tertiary education is fundamental, whether by itself or by peppering subject matter courses with technology. Those who use best the Internet for research, communications and knowledge management will have a definite edge in the modern knowledge societies.
* Age may not be the most critical factor distinguishing between the Internet content haves and have nots. Instead, skill and knowledge may be the decisive factors.
* While scenarios may only be partially realistic, they are intellectual and imaginative exercises. For example, they allow us to prepare better for potential problems and issues. We do not know where the threats to privacy and information security will come from next, but we know that we should prepare for them.

**Scenario Three: Government Prevails**

*Most of us assume that industry and NGOs will maintain parity with governments in today’s multi-stakeholder, consensus driven model of Internet governance. But this scenario is a future where citizens and industry worldwide rely heavily on governments for disaster response, leading to government control over Internet and communications technology policies.*

In 2011, the private sector was still driving Internet innovation and investment while government went along for the ride, content with minimal regulation and growing participation in multi-stakeholder governance bodies like ICANN and the IGF. But this arrangement was due to change, as governments seemed to be the only ones capable of responding to a rising tide of natural and man-made disasters that impacted Internet and communications technologies. Over time, this led most stakeholders to turn to governments for disaster response and precautions, many of which eroded the private sector’s role in Internet governance.

Looking at what transpired in 2011, perhaps we should have seen this coming. Events that year sowed seeds of change in the role of governments in Internet oversight, ranging from the Arab Spring to the Stanley Cup to the Japanese Tsunami. Growing concern over terrorism and cyber warfare drove new government-to-government collaboration under the banner of “enhanced cooperation” in controlling critical Internet resources.

*By 2020, most national governments – including the US – wanted to build on the success of multi-national cooperation to fight terrorism and respond to disasters. And multi-governmental organizations like the United Nations took every opportunity to coordinate and consolidate power under various mandates for global solutions – many of which involved control over Internet technologies and resources. This trend was particularly helpful to regimes seeking to limit freedom of information or control online commerce, all in the name of security and stability.*

*At many points along the way, there were protests from advocates of free expression and those suspicious of an intrusive, 'big brother' government. Many called for alternative approaches such as common principles or codes of conduct. But the global Internet had become critical to banking, healthcare, public safety, and communications, to the extent that daily life seemed impossible without a reliable and secure Internet connection. Moreover, the public and industry had come to rely heavily on governments’ unique abilities to respond to manmade and natural disasters. By 2025, governments and law enforcement had become deeply embedded in all aspects of Internet communications, content, and e-commerce.*

*Governments had prevailed.*

**Scenario Discussions and Audience Reactions:**

The audience initially reacted negatively to this scenario:

* This “Government Prevails” Scenario is not a desirable outcome.
* “I woke up this morning with nothing to be afraid of. Now, I’m afraid.”
* “We’d like to avoid this 1984 scenario, but it may be inevitable.”
* “It’s already happening.”
* More government intervention will mean less innovation

Then the discussion turned more positive as some participants suggested factors that would work against this scenario occurring:

* After a disaster, individuals, businesses and NGOs react faster than governments.
* Laws that restrict freedom are provoked because some people steal content or share too much personal data.
* Governments alone cannot afford to build and maintain the Internet. So governments know they must engage in public-private partnerships.
* Youth and the educated will counter-balance governments.

But that positive tone yielded to a realistic assessment of natural forces:

* “That’s a Pollyanna attitude” and will lull you into dismissing existent threats to Internet freedom.
* Freedom will eventually give way to privacy, security, and the rule of law. “Online civil liberties don’t poll very well against law and order.”
* The open Internet of today came from conscious choices in engineering and policy. If those choices are changed, the Internet will become less open.

The audience provided ideas to help avoid the “Government Prevails” scenario from happening:

* Governments should fight for online freedoms globally.
* Encourage governments to embrace the multi-stakeholder policy models that are currently working.
* Governments should engage in public-private partnerships for creation and management of Internet infrastructure.
* Industry should respect laws and governments, because it’s not “Us vs. Them”.
* Industry must make the right choices as it designs new Internet services
* ICANN must avoid creating new problems for governments to deal with.
* IGF should not make policy, but should stick to capacity building.
* IGF should engage more voices, including through remote participation
* Finally, there was agreement to ask the global IGF participants and leaders for their reactions to the scenario of “Government Prevails

**Plenary Discussion of Scenario Stories: The Internet -- 2025 Scenarios and Implications for the future of Internet Governance**

The afternoon plenary session included 5 minute overviews of all scenarios and their workshop discussions, as reported above. After these presentations before plenary participants, IGF-USA participants debated the scenarios and offered further perspectives, to supplement the workshop outputs.

Note: The Scenarios will form a significant part of the IGF-USA 2011 report into IGF Nairobi, September, 2011. Link to:<http://www.elon.edu/e-web/predictions/igf_usa/igf_usa_2011_scenarios_implications.xhtml>

AdditionalObservations from plenary attendees:

* The messages from the workshop sessions resonate and are accepted in large – significant audience support for the statements from the workshops
* And, Scenarios are a useful approach to examining, and thinking about trends that may otherwise escape focus in IG – think more about how to use
* Re Disaster response: The private sector deserves more credit for disaster prevention and response.  Governments are not the only ones responding when things go wrong.
* Re: role of youth overall: Digital "fluency" is more than just digital literacy.  We have to continue to educate youth on the obligations of digital citizenship.
	+ Youth comment: “Requiring a license to use the Internet is a terrible idea.  We love that the Internet is always available.  How can we preserve what's right about the Internet while trying to control the wrong things that happen there?”
* A future of too much government is scary, and risky: Dysfunctional Internet regulation or over-regulation may have disastrous consequences for innovation and economic development.
	+ Audience members shared examples of controversial legislation, e.g., the new Tennessee law that makes it a crime to use the Internet in "causing emotional distress".  The general sense is that most of this legislation is impossible to put into practice.  No government will be able to fully protect or isolate its citizens.
	+ Rules should be based on principles, but not overly complex.
	+ Sometimes other solutions from public private can work better.
	+ An audience member recounted the Vancouver riot story of the use of cell phones to capture participants in the recent riots as if it were a beneficial use of social media. But participants from the *Government Prevails* scenario were concerned that many Vancouver citizens were accused only because they happened to be photographed in the vicinity of riotous violence. The conclusion of the discussants was that due process should not be short-circuited by mere visibility, and citizen reporting. Use of governments of similar approaches to capturing citizen actions emerged as a topic, but was not well developed as a topic, due to time.
* The idea of treaties and ‘government only’ solutions is scary. It may be happening, but stakeholders need to rally solutions and approaches to address – in all countries. How can we build scalable options?
* Solutions may not yet be available in developing countries – it is a global Internet. More focus is needed on solutions and activities, but also within the US – where awareness isn’t broad enough.
* Multi-stakeholder representation in matters of Internet governance is critical. This is *our* Internet, not the Internet of governments and corporations. Engaging more citizens to participate and ensuring appropriate representation, both individually and through civil society organizations, is critical to the process. The young must be present in the process

**Afternoon Plenary Speech**

During the final plenary, the audience heard from Larry Strickling, Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information & Administrator of National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), U.S. Department of Commerce. A link to his speech can be found here: [http://www.ntia.doc.gov/speechtestimony/2011/remarks-assistant-secretary-strickling-Internet-governance-forum-usa](http://www.ntia.doc.gov/speechtestimony/2011/remarks-assistant-secretary-strickling-internet-governance-forum-usa)

Strickling’s remarks focused on the importance of preserving the multi-stakeholder model within the Internet and its decision making bodies; as well as the United States’ priority to keep such open governance going and encouraging less of the treaty-based and regulatory models of governance.

Even with the threats to this model, Strickling expressed hope in the continued promotion of it by giving a few examples. The first was an overview of the progress that had occurred within ICANN to improve its transparency and accountability through its 27 recommendation report submitted in December and implemented in June.

Furthermore, he stated that ICANN had striven to include within its new gTLD program points from the GAC proposals. Strickling supported the importance of increased government involvement as stakeholders to “combat” assertions like those of the ITU who seeks to be able to veto decisions made by the ICANN board.

Next, he commented on the OECD communiqué which also supports the importance of multi-stakeholder models. He then asserted that more effort was needed to encourage participation of nations that are not familiar with benefits of such a cooperative model, or who lack experience in implementing such approaches.

Finally, he mentioned that the IGF in Nairobi would be a great place to further the work to implement more multi-stakeholderism and that help from anyone concerned in keeping it alive would be needed.

**Closing Session**:

Link to: <http://www.elon.edu/e-web/predictions/igf_usa/igf_usa_2011_closing_remarks.xhtml>

Chengetai Masango returned to the closing session to continue discussion of key issues related to the IGF. He also gave an invitation for all to participate in the IGF in Nairobi, noting the benefits of taking part in the IGF for the future of the Internet and its correct governance.

Marilyn Cade, Chief Catalyst of IGF-USA, gave summary closing remarks. She reminded the participants that in 2010, she likened the stage of play to the early stages of a tsunami – when only small rumblings can be heard far out in the ocean, but with a building toward harmful and sweeping implications if they continue and grow. She noted that while many support Internet governance, that the broad awareness and involvement simply isn’t yet in place, and gave a call to action to get more involvement in the issues related to Internet governance.

Cade made a strong prediction that, as she is observing and participating in events around the world, it is clear the more proactive efforts by concerned stakeholders are needed. Cade warned that the outcomes of inaction for the state of the Internet could be disastrous and that all stakeholders need to become aware, and engaged. She encouraged further involvement from those attending in the IGF 2011 in Nairobi and invited any participants not yet engaged with the IGF-USA to join future events.

**Thanking those who made the IGF-USA a reality:**

The session closed with a round of thanks with special reference to Imagining the Internet’s team; interns who helped in planning and orchestrating the day’s logistics; Kim Huey, who acts as Executive Coordinator, and Torey Brown, who acted as the part time associate for the IGF-USA 2011. Cade also recognized and thanked the Steering Group for their ongoing participation, and recognized the sponsors, whose financial support made the IGF-USA possible.

The session concluded.

**APPENDIX : Administrative and Management; Funding Challenges;**

 **Expanding Participation –Civil Society/NGO/Academia in the IGF-USA:**

 **Improvements overall**

**Administration and Management:**

Funding of the IGF-USA itself is a minimalistic approach – funding outright costs, with secretariat/coordination provided on a pro bono basis. This is dependent upon a considerable contribution of pro bono coordinating from the Chief Catalyst/Coordinator and Executive Coordinator, and use of Interns and in kind contributions of other resources by SG members.

To date, members of the SG host the facilities for the planning meetings; fund the conference calls; and contribute to content, management of the website content. Another member acts as the ‘executive management coordinator”. The overall coordination is also a pro bono contribution.

SG members are generous with their participation and intellectual contribution to the IGF-USA, and it is hard to document the impressive contributions made by members from civil society, academia, NGOs, business, and government. However, coordinating and continually recruiting such participation requires significant time from the chief catalyst/coordinator, and from all SG members to expand the impact of the IGF-USA and to achieve the IGF-USA mission.

The approach for 2009, 2010, and 2011 worked well, but while this provides a distributed and ‘limited financial cost’ approach, it also has its limitations, and challenges for the pro bono coordinators, and SG stakeholder groups. For instance, each year, the need for more outreach and funding for speakers from stakeholders grows, and to date, we have not fully addressed this important need.

Thus, in 2012, some substantial improvements will be implemented, as approved by the SG.

Additional part time/short term assistance: In 2011, for the first time, IGF-USA benefitted from a part time and short term associate [a few hours a week for approximately three months] to assist with coordination/administrative support for planning, coordination of interns, limited support to the Chief Catalyst/Coordinator, and Executive Coordinator’s functions. This will be proposed for 2012 but will be based on available funding and resources.

**Financial Matters:**

A member of the SG served as financial advisor in both 2010 and 2011. While sponsorship for 2009 and 2010 did not fully fund the actual costs of IGF-USA activities presenting a serious and unaddressed challenge. In 2011, sponsorship was broader, more diversified, and provided funding for all expenses. Funding challenges still remain, noting that some parties who routinely fund other national and regional IGFs are not yet confirmed for funding for IGF-USA.

Expansion of funding across other business sectors, such as social networking companies, and high tech providers is also a further goal, to enable increased support to events and materials to undertake outreach.

Travel funding for NGOs, youth, and academic experts for IGF-USA 2012, including establishing dedicated funding for bringing youth participants to IGF 2012, will enhance IGF-USA’s effectiveness.

Discussions in the SG indicate a strong interest in three regional US initiatives with academic partners, and funding will be needed to support these initiatives and expansion of participation, sponsorship of refreshments, any meeting costs, etc.

As IGF-USA SG examines its program of events for 2012, recommended enhancements, and instantiation of financial support will be part of the improvements to the IGF USA.

**Participation of youth/young people in developing and designing the program, and in delivery/management:**

While IGF-USA had 3 interns *on site* during IGF 2010 that helped with welcoming registered participants and had youth participants in workshops and main sessions, the full evolution of inclusion of youth participants throughout remains a goal. Our academic leaders and past youth alumni are key to this evolving further for 2012.

During 2011, a concerted expansion of intern participation for support of the event was added, as well as an expansion of youth participation throughout the program. The workshop role /participation is discussed elsewhere. During 2011, several SG members generously included their interns in planning during the year. In particular, Tom Donnelly, Akerman: Joy Spahr, AT&T Innovation Center and Eric Loeb, AT&T included participation in the IGF-USA planning in their interns’ assignments. Other SG members – Access Partnerships and TechAmerica made their interns available for the event itself. Janna Anderson and Derrick Cogman and Dima Epstein worked closely with their students on their participation and involvement.

Besides focusing on participation of young people in the program, managing the inclusion of interns in our planning will be included in our activities for 2012, so that we maximize their inclusion and involvement where feasible, but recognize that they are a limited resource. Note: Many interns leave their positions prior to the IGF-USA, so their on site availability as an additional resource can be limited.

While this represents more work for the small coordinating team, it also engaged a number of young participants –– one of our goals, and drew in ‘interns’ from law firms and companies in DC [ages typically 20-23], and through our leading academic participants: Cornell, Syracuse, Elon, American, Georgetown – young people from 19-22.

In addition, one of the workshops [Disaster/ICTs] drew the interest of a recent graduate who has launched an initiative in global disaster intermediation. What to do to leverage these exchanges with our youth participants after they graduate in one of the topics of discussion in the IGF-USA SG for 2011, EoY, to plan for launching 2012 planning.

To prepare for 2012, the Administrative Coordinator, and IGF-USA Associate are collaborating on a one page ‘job description’ that SG members can include in their briefings for their interns, and university professors can include in their outreach, to extend youth, and young people participation in planning, delivery/management, and participation.

In summary, a workshop focused on youth was part of IGF-USA 2009; youth were integrated into IGF-USA main panels in 2009 and 2010, and in 2011, a workshop organized by youth, for youth was part of the main program. Yet, the SG recognizes that a different approach and different approaches to inclusion to IG are needed to make youth participation increasingly relevant and influential within the IGF-USA.

**Expansion of participation of NGOs and Civil Society /increasing role of academic leaders/think tanks and outreach to interest groups focused on users perspectives:**

The SG discussions have included acknowledgement of the need to significantly increase outreach to NGOs, civil society, special interest groups, and Academic thought leaders for 2012. Discussions about Congressional briefings continue to be ‘goals’, and not yet actualized, although invitations were sent to key Congressional staff for IGF-USA 2011.

Other activities – such as academic conferences or events that are organized for related purposes may offer opportunities for leveraging the IGF-USA activities.

**Advice for Improving Overall in Administrative /Coordination:**

* Establish an earlier deadline for printing of materials.
* Improve the present NING site’s usefulness, and enhance use of social media as additional ‘tools’ and resources.
* Never do the event again on a Monday. The weekend gap before the event takes away some valuable preparation time, especially with reliance on interns and volunteer support.
* Continued enhancements to online registration process; add ability for registrant to print out a ticket telling them the specific workshops/scenarios they signed up for.
* Also, need to find a way to have a registration countdown physically on the registration site to encourage earlier registration.
* Establish training for interns. Try to maintain a significant number of interns. Some are need in early stages of planning, with others coming in for on site assistance. Earlier contact with the interns for briefings/training is preferred to enable both participation and support functions.
* More media outreach needed.
* Consideration of events during rest of year can take place at academic settings, collaborated or led by academic partners or could be incorporated as workshop panels into other events, if multi stakeholder participants can be identified to accept speaking sessions.
* Use of Social Media: Facebook/Twitter : A new approach will be piloted for IGF by IGF-USA members, with a new ongoing approach introduced for EoY 2011 through 2012.

IGF-USA Attendance Overview:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** |
| Registered | 167 | 211 | 234 |
| Actual | 207 | 226 | 247 |

**Attachment A: Steering/Planning Group List**

* Fiona Alexander, US State Department
* Janna Anderson, Elon University and “Imagining the Internet”
* Stephen Balkam, Family Online Safety Institute
* Dick Beaird, US State Department
* Lindsey Beck, Freedom House
* Don Blumenthal, PIR
* Chris Boam, Verizon
* Iren Borissova, Verisign
* Jeff Brueggeman, AT&T
* Becky Burr, Wilmer Hale
* Marilyn Cade, ICT Strategies, mCADE LLC
* Alessandra Carozza, AMGlobal Consulting
* Derrick Cogburn, American University
* Pam Covington, Verisign
* Brian Cute, PIR
* Steve DelBianco, NetChoice
* Robyn Disselkoen, US State Department
* Tom Donnelly, AkermanSenterfitt
* Dmitry Epstein, Cornell University
* Sarah Falvey, Google
* Frederick Felman, MarkMonitor
* Liesyl Franz, TechAmerica
* James Galvin, Afilias
* Robert Guerra, Freedom House
* Anders Halvorsen, WITSA
* Cathy Handley ARIN
* Chris Hemmerlein, NTIA
* Kimberly Huey, ACT
* BrendenKuerbis, Internet Governance Project
* Andrew Mack, AMGlobal Consulting
* Leslie Martinkovics, Verizon
* Garland McCoy, Technology Education Institute
* Steve Metalitz, Mitchell Silberberg &Knupp LLP
* Pablo Molina, Georgetown University Law Center
* Milton Mueller, Syracuse University
* Mike Nelson, Georgetown University
* Kelly O’Keefe, Access Partnership
* Dan O’Neill, GIIC
* Audrey Plonk, Intel
* WaldaRoseman, the Internet Society
* Heather Shaw, United States Council for International Business
* John Struble, US State Department
* Theresa Swinehart, Verizon
* Nancy Weiss, IMLS
* Sally Wentworth, the Internet Society
* Jonathan Zuck, Association for Competitive Technologi

**Interns:**

* Will Lewis, Access Partnerships
* Keith Weber, AT&T
* Alex Stanford, AkermanSeinerfeit
* Morgan Prewitt, AT&T
* Brandon Fuller, AT&T Innovation Center
* Santiago Ballen, TechAmerica \*
* Tim Prey, TechAmerica \*
* Scott Gillespe, TechAmerica \*

\* Onsite support for Event

**IGF-USA 2011 Sponsors**
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1. IGF-USA was launched in 2009 as a national IGF initiative. More information about IGF-USA 2009 and IGF-USA 2010 can b found at www//igf-usa.us. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Dan O‘Neill, GIIC, Coordinator; Michael Nelson, Georgetown University, Moderator; Speakers: Mark Crandall, Google; Jeff Brueggeman, AT&T; John Morris, CDT; Danny McPherson, Verisign; Fred Whiteside, NIST; Amie Stephanovich, EPIC; Jonathan Zuck, ACT [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Sally Wentworth, ISOC, Moderator; Panelists: John Curran, ARIN; Rex Bullinger, NCTA; Dr. Stephen Crocker, Shinkuro; Paul Brigner,MPAA; George Ou, Digital Society; David Sohn, CDT; Don Blumenthal, PIR; Dr. Jim Galvin, Afilias, (and Workshop Coordinator); Jane Coffin, NTIA, special advisor to workshop [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Fiona Alexander, U.S. Department of Commerce, NTIA and Shane Tews, Verisign, Co-moderators; Presentation of Principles: Heather Shaw, USCIB; Chris Hemmerlein, NTIA; Shelia Flynn, U.S. State Department; Leslie Martinkovics, Verizon; Sarah Labowitz, U.S. State Department; Iren Borissova, Verisign: Compare and Contrast; Roundtable Participants: Jackie Ruff, Verizon; Michael Nelson, Georgetown University; Jeff Brueggeman, AT&T; Robert Guerra, Freedom House; Cynthia Wong, CDT; Susan Morgan, GNI; Liesyl Franz, TechAmerica [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Frederick Felman, Mark Monitor, Moderator; Panelists:Bobbie Flaim, FBI; Suzanne Radell, NTIA; Jon Nevett, Domain Dimensions, LLC; Amber Sterling, American Medical College Association; Ron Andruff, DotSport; Pat Kane, Verisign; Brian Winterfeldt, Steptoe & Johnson LLP; Jamie Hedlund, ICANN [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Participants: William Vogt,Georgetown; William O’Connor,Georgetown; Nick Troiano,Georgetown; Ronda Ataalla, Elon; Kellye Coleman, Elon; Jeff Stern, Elon; Kristen Steves, Cornell; Chelsea Rowe, Cornell; Moderators: Ali Hamed, Cornell; Colin Donohue, Emory; Event Coordinators: Dmitry Epstein, Janna Anderson [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Moderator: Kelly O‘Keefe, Director, Access Partnership, LLC Panelists: Joe Burton, Communications and Information Policy, US State Department; Jim Bugel, Public Safety and Homeland Security; Corbin Fields, Sparkrelief; Roland A. LaPlante, SVP, Afilias ; Keith Robertory, Disaster Services Technology, American Red Cross; Tim Woods, Cisco [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Scenario Team Members:Garland McCoy, Technology Education Institute; Andrew Mack, AMGlobal; Alessandra Carozza, AMGlobal; Pablo Molina, Georgetown Law Center; Chris Hemmerlein, US DoC/NTIA; Kelly O‘Keefe, Access Partnerships; Alex Stanford, Intern/Ackerman Senterfitt; Pam Covington, Verisign; Walda Roseman, ISOC; Steve DelBianco, NetChoice; ex officio - Marilyn Cade, ICT Strategies [↑](#footnote-ref-9)