

Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

Synthesis Paper

Open Consultations

19-20 February 2014, Geneva, Switzerland (UNHQ)

I. Introduction

1. This paper summarizes comments received in preparation of the ninth IGF meeting, which is scheduled to take place in Istanbul, Turkey. This paper takes into account comments received by the IGF Secretariat in response to its call for contributions by 10 February 2014. In total, 26 contributions were received by the Secretariat. All of these inputs can be found in their entirety on the IGF website.¹
2. All the contributions and open consultation transcripts will be posted on the IGF website throughout the preparatory process of the Istanbul meeting. The readers of this paper are encouraged to read these contributions and the open consultations transcripts, which will be posted for public view after the consultations, for further details.
3. As always, the contributions touched on a wide variety of issues. Some focused on taking stock of the 2013 meeting in Bali while others made specific recommendations for the 2014 meeting.

II. General comments on the 8th IGF meeting in Bali

4. Many expressions of gratitude were given to the Government of Indonesia for their successful hosting of the 8th IGF.
5. It was said that ‘the 8th IGF meeting in Bali was again an example of a well-organized meeting at an exquisite venue for which our appreciation goes to the Host country and the Organizing team. Congratulations was also expressed to the IGF Secretariat for running a smooth schedule with a limited number of staff.. Many contributors stressed that the IGF has become a “go to place” where the community gathers to share experiences and exchange information.
6. It was said that the 8th IGF successfully brought together an extensive range of leaders from the many communities interested in Internet governance, and provided a unique opportunity to have frank and open discussions on a wider range of issues. Many contributions noted that the IGF had progressively matured in 2013 and discussions in Bali took many broad Internet governance policy discussions forward, towards points of convergence.

¹ The synthesis paper is a summary of the various contributions received by the Secretariat. Some specific suggestions are included verbatim, a complete list of the contributions can be found on the IGF website here: <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/contributionsigf>

7. Some of the specific aspects singled out for expression of appreciation by the contributors were the following:

- The hospitality and generosity of the Indonesian hosts;
- The preparations done by the IGF Secretariat and the Host Country throughout the year leading up to the meeting;
- UNDESA for providing the institutional home for and administrative support to the IGF Secretariat, and for supporting the IGF process in general;
- The hard work of the multistakeholder organizing committee;
- The presence of Indonesian public institutions, internet actors, community media networks, civil society organizations, and human rights and minority sexual rights activists;
- The facilities, amenities and the availability of food and coffee were said to be dramatically improved;
- At the delegates' registration, wherein the staff assisted the delegates pleasantly, faster and efficiently;
- The good layout of the main session rooms and workshop rooms for discussions, including the reconfiguration of the main room for some main sessions;
- Continued recognition and appreciation for the availability of remote participation, for the remote hubs and for remote moderation;
- Appreciation for the workshop transcripts, summary reports, web-casts, increased social media activity and other records of the IGF meeting that can be found on the IGF website.

8. The IGF 'pre-events' were greatly appreciated and many contributors recommended that they should both be continued and strengthened in 2014. The new delegates briefing session was also noted to be a welcome addition and should also be continued and improved in moving forward.

9. Some inputs strongly appreciated the Human Rights dimension of the 8th IGF, including the inclusion of topics related to human rights issues in its main agenda, and providing a space for discussion in the workshops.

10. On the other hand, there were some criticisms on aspects related to the 2013 meeting, which should be kept in mind in planning the 2014 meeting, as follows:

- The late confirmation of the host-country location made it difficult for many to participate fully;
- There were some visa issues which also made it difficult for some to join in Bali;
- Criteria for participation in the high level leaders meeting on 'day 0' was not clear for some;
- The unintentional vulnerability in the registration process which put some participants' personal information at risk;

III. Comments on the Main Sessions, Workshops and Other Events, Participation and Overall Substance of the 8th IGF in Bali and Suggestions and Recommendations to improve the 9th IGF in Istanbul

11. The plenary ‘focus sessions’ that were introduced in Bali were lauded by many contributors, in particular the newly introduced sessions on Internet governance principles and multistakeholder principles, surveillance, and human rights.
12. It was noted that progress was made in 2013 in ensuring that workshop proposals were updated and completed in a timely manner, and that the workshop selection process was greatly improved. Overall, the agenda for the meeting was said to have improved and was again responsive to community inputs from all stakeholders on equal footing.
13. Some contributions commented that there were too many workshops in parallel at times. Some suggested that main sessions and workshops could be separated to avoid overlaps which make it difficult for many interested participants to join sessions which are most important to them.
14. Many contributions suggested that the 9th IGF could take a step forward if it were to practically use designated main sessions, workshops, other sessions or working groups to develop non-binding opinions, recommendations and/or policy principles that stakeholders could use to address pressing current issues. While still maintaining the key characteristic of being an open platform for discussion, many inputs urged the IGF to take a step forward towards more tangible outcomes, as recommended by the CSTD WG on Improvements to the IGF.
15. It was suggested that the IGF could adapt some of the IETF characteristics in producing more tangible outcomes, specifically, some kind of policy development process inspired by the approach taken in the IETF with respect to the development of Internet protocols and informative documents. The IGF could, for example, when producing recommendations, opinions, principles, etc., use the fundamental principles of cooperation, adherence to principles, collective empowerment, availability and voluntary adoption. The concept of documentation related to best practices was emphasized by many to be important for the next IGF.
16. Some inputs noted that the MAG, together with all stakeholders, should discuss further on how to make the IGF more of a year round activity (rather than an annual conference) and how to streamline the inclusion of the outcomes of national and regional meetings into the global meeting. It was said that the IGF should improve its capacity to sustain a work programme between meetings. One specific suggestion called for an improved online collaborative platform for interacting with other IGF stakeholders throughout the year. Increasing inter-sessional work was mentioned by many contributors, and ‘Working Groups’, it was said, could be formed under the supervision of the MAG to bring forward various discussions.
17. It was suggested that existing and new Dynamic Coalitions could be used to elaborate specific draft recommendations to be discussed at the IGF and eventually recommended by the IGF itself or by other intergovernmental organizations.

18. Many inputs noted that important issues on Internet governance will be discussed throughout 2014, starting in April with the Global Multistakeholder Meeting on the Future of Internet Governance. The 2014 will take place at a crucial juncture and it was noted by many that the IGF should be reactive and attentive to the various discussions going on in other fora (WTDC, Brazil Event, WSIS Review, ITU Plenipotentiary, and WGEC, among others). The IGF should therefore, while still maintaining its own independence, find space within its agenda to discuss, and if appropriate affirm and commit to build upon recommendations and general work done at other similar meetings.
19. It was suggested that the IGF should address certain policy questions that may be considered either controversial or time critical at the Istanbul meeting, as it is the ideal space to tackle orphan issues that lack any other multistakeholder mechanism for global coordination.
20. Many contributions called for the National and Regional IGFs to more effectively feed issues into the global IGF so that the issues at the global level are more so reflective of the concerns and challenges raised by these initiatives.
21. One proposal suggested seeking inspiration from the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) in terms of producing outcome documents based on voluntary adoption and starting substantive inter-sessional work. The proposal also suggested reviving Best Practice Forums and introducing Bird of a “Feather-type sessions” as session types that could help offer tangible solutions and outcome documentation to stakeholders on certain issues. It was also suggested that more ‘open spaces’ should be built into the program for the 2014 meeting.
22. On participation, it was suggested that the IGF should look for ways to institutionalize a process that ensures a constant flow of new stakeholder participants. It was said that it is very important to continue to strive for greater geographical diversity with ongoing outreach to potential participants from developing countries. The IGF and the MAG need to reach out to all stakeholders, and in particular governments, well ahead of the next IGF in Istanbul. This requires early agreement and communication of the agenda which should be agreed upon after receiving inputs from all stakeholders as well as national and regional IGFs. It was suggested that this requires that the IGF not shun pressing and difficult issues –the more current the issue set, the more relevant the event, the greater the participation. To facilitate this, a MAG WG could be set up to address outreach and participation issues.
23. Uncertainties related to funding were said to sometimes deter participation and diminish the IGF’s relevance. Various efforts to resolve some of the funding challenges have been discussed and this should be continued. It was said that it is essential that these issues be resolved and a MAG WG (along with appropriate representation from UNDESA, the host country, etc.) should be set up to address them in a fully transparent manner. One suggestion was that the IGF could consider hiring a full time fundraiser to ensure that there is sufficient funding both for the annual IGF conference and in raising funds for scholarships to support NGOs and small business operators (example: cyber café owners) in developing countries to attend. Some contributions stated that a more flexible

mechanism for funding the IGF is needed. It was also requested that host country agreements should be made public.

24. Some contributions suggested some reforms in the functions and roles of the MAG and Secretariat. Some contributions requested the MAG to produce its annual reports. Some contributions stated that smaller Working Groups should be established within the MAG to handle specific issues. The reappointment of a Special Advisor was also suggested by many as an urgent and important issue.
25. Increasing remote participation and genuine e-participation at the annual IGFs and during inter-sessional work were stressed by many stakeholders. Dedicated working groups and additional funding should be sourced to address this important issue.
26. The Capacity Building track that was built into the 2013 meeting was said to be very useful. The stakeholders would like this track to continue and grow in 2014.
27. It was suggested that the IGF should make a major effort to bring national security policy makers into the conversation at the next IGF. In light of current discussions around security and privacy, their absence is glaring. Similarly, IGF should make a major effort to bring the private security industry into the conversation at the next IGF. Their absence is similarly notable.

IV. Suggestions for Main Themes/Sub-Themes/Issues for the 9th IGF in Istanbul

28. Some suggestions were made in regards to the main theme and sub-themes for the 9th IGF in Istanbul. Some specific suggestions were made while other broader subjects were proposed without a particular 'title'. The following were the suggestions for overall theme and sub-themes, as well as, some possible workshop topics which are listed in no particular order (no rank or preference).

- “Where Local Access Meets Local Policy”, the nexus of access and policy at the "ground level".
- Affordability of Access Technologies for Internet Governance;
- Connectivity, Interconnection and Peering;
- Contents Development and Management;
- Electricity and its Challenges in Developing Countries;
- Enabling Efficient and Effective Service in Internet Governance;
- Equipment requirements, computers and accessories, servers, etc.;
- Facilitating the Creation of a High Competitive Service Sector, Fuelling Economic Growth Cross Cutting;
- How to influence Internet Service Providers on their Internet ‘tarification’; and
- Human Capacity Building;

- ICT/IT Applications and Deployment;
- Infrastructure and Broadband Access;
- Internet Exchange Point Implementation and Operation;
- Internet Governance Budgeting;
- IT Standards, its Evolution and Changes Management;
- Key Challenges and Relative Changes in ICT;
- Legal and Regulatory Framework;
- Managing Changes in Internet Governance;
- Online privacy issues were suggested to be discussed: 'Preserving that privacy should be the overall theme; Guidelines to avoid any intrusion into Internet users' private life should be set up';
- Promoting Social and Cultural Interaction and its Integration in Society Through the Use of ICT;
- Research Development and Innovations;
- Shareholding, Stakeholders and ICT Industry;
- The improvement of the Internet access in the enclosed developing countries towards the reduction of cost of Internet connection;
- The role of the ICANN ombudsman in ensuring fair play within the ICANN community, as a model for Internet governance within other Internet organizations;

Below were suggested issues:

- 'A practical approach towards building digital trust';
- 'Big Data and Human Rights: ethics, law, and technology';
- 'Services for empowerment displaced people' (Empower displaced people through online education services);
- "Internet Governance for Openness: Strengthening Multi-Stakeholder Cooperation for a Competitive, Inclusive and Democratic Internet";
- "The lowest price for the Internet access in the developing countries";
- Content development taking into account local values and local principles and what it needs to have a real content industry for access to all;
- Emergence of national and regional multistakeholder Internet Governance frameworks;
- Engagement of stakeholders from developing and least developed economies in Internet Governance;
- Evaluation of the 10 years and nine meetings of the global IGF. What alternatives

- may be proposed for the Internet governance post 2015? Do we need to re-engineer the IGF?;
- Evolution of the global multistakeholder Internet Governance frameworks;
 - Fostering a healthy, stable, resilient Internet ecosystem;
 - Innovation and free flow of information online;
 - Internet as a public service and public good: Access to all;
 - Legal and policy frameworks in a transnational cyberspace;
 - New gTLDs and Internationalized Domains Names (IDNs);
 - Operationalizing the multistakeholder model, building upon the discussions in Bali and elsewhere;
 - Personal Data Protection in a case of ISPs-State Security Agency Cooperation;
 - Privacy and net neutrality;
 - Promoting national and regional multistakeholder frameworks for IG. ‘Multistakeholderism’ in IG: Have we reached the limits?;
 - Socioeconomic benefits of one open Internet;
 - Strengthening and improving the IGF;
 - The IGF could discuss ‘organizing and sponsoring a project to conduct a comprehensive public security audit of Internet infrastructure, hardware, and software;
 - The IGF could discuss a ‘compilation of a comprehensive list of manufacturers of filtering technologies and their target audience;
 - The view of Young Entrepreneurs on Internet Governance;
 - Towards an open, resilient and secure Internet for emerging economies and Promoting Internet Exchange Points;
 - What must be on the agenda at the Cyberspace 2015 conference?;
 - What to do about the mismatch between standards and the implementation/knowledge?;

29. The role of the Internet in supporting development was mentioned by many to be an important topic for the IGF to move forward. It was said that many IGF stakeholders are actively involved in the WSIS+10 review processes and the formation of the new post-2015 development agenda. Some noted the lack of communication between the UN agencies in New York and Geneva/Paris regarding how one might impact the other. Within the post-2015 discussions, there is presently very little mention of the role that the Internet plays in supporting development. While, the discussions taking place within Internet Governance circles do not seem fully aware that a new development framework is being discussed, and the ramifications of this for the IGF. It was suggested that the IGF in 2014 should make an effort to discuss Internet governance in development terms, both

in explicit discussions on how the Internet could contribute towards supporting the new Sustainable Development Goals which will be the centerpiece of the post-2015 framework, and on what roles Internet governance and the IGF should play in the framework.

30. Some contributions supported further discussion of the ‘post-Snowden environment’ at the IGF 2014 in order to assess emerging trends in personal online security, online surveillance and the citizen-state relationship.
31. Some stakeholders wish to see intellectual property kept firmly on the agenda of the 2014 IGF, and to emphasize discussions on the copyright reforms at an international level. It was suggested that full and frank discussions of the major roadblocks to international copyright reforms should be placed on the table at the 2014 IGF and perhaps to be discussed following clear presentations by interested stakeholders on the international frameworks which they would like to see implemented.

V. Comments and suggestions on logistical issues of the 8th IGF in Bali and recommendations for logistical improvements for the 9th IGF in Istanbul

32. It was said that from a logistic and organisational point of view, ‘the IGF could benefit from a more structured agenda with eventually fewer workshops; Updated information on the website is encouraged to promote the IGF website as the legitimate source of information for IGF program issues and to avoid misunderstandings and confusion in the wider community. This would make it easier and clearer for participants and could in the meantime enhance participation to and interaction during individual workshop, including remote participation.’
33. Efforts should be made in improving facilitation of remote participation in the interest of wider inclusion with due consideration in resolving the problem of time differences of participants.
34. It was suggested that a mobile phone application could be developed which would make the agenda and programme available in real-time to participants at the meetings and those following remotely.
35. Many contributions encouraged improvements in the following areas: media operations, badging, beverages and food breaks, broadband and wifi connection, delegate bags, host country website, printing, etc. The MAG and Secretariat should continue to monitor logistical matters in a serious manner to maintain the IGFs standing as a high-level and accessible global forum.
36. Inputs were received from the following individuals and organizations:
 - Antoine Kantiza
 - Association for Progressive Communications (APC)
 - Center for Democracy and Technology (CDT)

- Chris LaHatte, Ombudsman
- Coppens Pasteur Ndayiragije, IT Specialist and SETIC Responsible in Charge of Supervision, Monitoring and Evaluation of National Backbone Network Construction Based on Broadband Infrastructure in Burundi
- Deirdre Williams
- Dynamic Coalition on Network Neutrality
- Garland McCoy, Technology Education Institute
- Georges Niatchak
- Input on behalf of the four Regional ccTLD organizations (AfTLD, APTLD, LACTLD and CENTR)
- International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA)
- Internet and Jurisdiction Project
- Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)
- Internet Society (ISOC)
- João Carlos Caribé
- John Laprise, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Communication in Residence, Northwestern University in Qatar, Northwestern University
- Juuso Moisander, Commercial Secretary, Information Society and ICT, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Department for External Economic Relations (On behalf of the Finnish Multistakeholder WSIS group)
- Makane Faye, Chief, Knowledge Management and Library Services Section (KLSS), Public Information and Knowledge Management Division (PIKMD), United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) (Submission on behalf of African Stakeholders)
- ICC/BASSIS - Members of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) and its initiative, Business Action to Support the Information Society (BASIS)
- Nkurunaiaa, Jean Paul, Trainer in Computer and Internet Policy
- NL IGF (Netherlands)
- Prof Antoine Kantiza, Master UTICEF, Webmaster à la Radio-Télévision Nationale du Burundi
- Submission from some participants in the Best Bits network (bestbits.net): signatories named at <http://bestbits.net/igf-2014-submission/>
- The National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow)
- Together against Cybercrime
- Tossapon Tassanakunlapan, Faculty of Law, Chiangmai University, Thailand