

IGF 2016 Workshop Report Template

Session Title	OF15: IEEE – Advancing Solutions for Internet Inclusion
Date	06 December 2016
Time	12:00-13:00
Session Organizer	Karen McCabe , Senior Director Technology Policy, IEEE-SA
Chair/Moderator	Oleg Logvinov , CEO IoTecha, Chair of IEEE Internet Initiative
Rapporteur/Notetaker	James Wendorf , Program Director, IEEE Internet Initiative
List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations	<p>Chris Jannuzzi, Executive Director, IEEE Photonics Society and Technical Programs</p> <p>Min Jiang, Associate Professor of Communication, UNC Charlotte, and Affiliate Researcher at the Center for Global Communication Studies, University of Pennsylvania</p> <p>Limor Shmerling Magazanik, Director of The Israeli Law, Information and Technology Authority</p> <p>Juan Gonzalez, Senior Strategist Office of the Chief Technology Office Cyber Security and Communications US DHS</p> <p>Ning Kong, Director of International Dept, China Internet Network Information Center</p> <p>Osama Manzar, Founder and Director Digital Empowerment Foundation</p>
Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):	<p>Some of the key issues were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Importance of connecting technologists and policymakers in locally relevant discussions, on a global scale, to identify and work toward solutions for the most important internet policy issues. - Universal internet connectivity and inclusion has emerged as one of the most important opportunities and challenges to be addressed. - What does it mean to be a “netizen”, and what role/control will governments have in internet and information sovereignty? - Growing concerns about privacy in the internet of things (IoT), and transparency about what is being done with the information collected. Need for a standard to certify the level of privacy provided by each device and service. - Requiring digital inclusion (connectivity, biometric identity) to access important services, if done too soon or improperly, can itself lead to digital exclusion for those who can’t afford it or for whom it is otherwise inaccessible. - Last mile connectivity is not just the responsibility of large corporations, but can also be done by civil enterprises and others. - Written regulations can be interpreted in many different ways and require clarifications from the policy makers with the help and input of technologists. Need for a database of best and worst practices.
If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph	Not applicable.

summary for each Presentation	
Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session: (3 paragraphs)	<p>This session was about the IEEE Internet Initiative's efforts to connect technologists and policy makers globally and locally, noting that technologies are global but policies are local. From the Experts in Technology and Policy (ETAP) Forums held around the world, universal internet inclusion arose as one of the top issues to be addressed by the Initiative. IEEE joined others to address the issue, including the US Dept. of State's Global Connect Initiative. There is a bias toward action, toward making things happen. For example, in a project in Tunisia, a group of undergraduate students are working toward the goal of getting all schools in Tunisia online. This and other projects leverage the local IEEE members and communities.</p> <p>In China, the country has become an economic and technology powerhouse with more than 700M internet users. There have been shifts in how people think about the internet and what it means to be a "netizen". "Internet Sovereignty" and "information sovereignty" are two phrases adopted by the government, and each includes some aspects of control. The trend in China is toward centrality of policymaking about the internet. There is also a lot of concern for privacy, which is especially lacking in the discussions about IoT. Currently there is no standard for how new devices should protect the privacy level of users' data. We need a standard for certifying the level of privacy compliance for each device. A follow up action could be to work on such a standard. Other important issues are how to avoid DDoS attacks, which requires cooperation across regions and nations, and how to attract more inclusion by using local languages.</p> <p>The ETAP Forum in Tel Aviv brought together legal and privacy people with the technical experts, to achieve better understanding and develop practical recommendations for how to incorporate privacy in IoT. Transparency is required about what is being done with the information collected. IoT devices need to provide user interfaces that let people know what is being done with their data and for what purposes. The ability to opt in or out is important.</p> <p>In the US there is work to increase automation to help with real-time response and decision making, and for sharing information about threats. The trend is away from proprietary solutions, to use more interoperable systems. IoT has become a key focus area in security discussions. There is also strong support for multistakeholder approaches to addressing these issues.</p> <p>India, with a total population of 1.3B, has the second highest number of connected users, and the second highest number using social media. But only 400M are connected, with 800M-900M not connected, so India is also one of most unconnected countries. It was noted that internet technology can itself lead to digital exclusion. The</p>

	<p>policy says you must be online to receive services, but poor people can't afford it. Also, universal identity using biometric machines (fingerprints) does not work well for poor workers. Connectivity has not yet become a consumer good. Efforts are underway to use wireless mesh and unlicensed spectrum technologies in poor, remote areas. But you are required to have a license for larger scale connectivity. Last mile connectivity/access is not just the responsibility of large corporations. It can also be done by civil enterprises and others.</p> <p>It was noted that written regulations can be interpreted in many different ways. For example, in China there are new regulations on cybersecurity that everyone is struggling to understand. There have been many iterations of the drafts, and how the policies are drafted still leaves the problem of how to implement them. In India, the telecom regulation is similarly confusing. The Government wants to permit community radio licenses to allow more options, and has recently issued a request for information. Is there a place for a cross-country effort on best practices for policy development and implementation, involving both policy makers and technologists (for example, the practice of consultations before each policy is rolled out)? There is also a need for a database of worst/very bad practices. One follow up action could be to develop such a database of best and worst practices.</p> <p>Several benefits were noted from the ETAP Forum discussions. They bring the technology community into the discussions with non-engineers. They also bring the policy people and lawyers into the technology discussions, connecting the different people with shared goals to address the shared problems from all the different viewpoints. The result is getting actionable information from the different stakeholders. This helps the policy makers understand the technology, and the technologists understand how to make technology understood by others. For example, in looking at connectivity and how to demystify it, can we make it a household understanding by simple people in remote parts of the world so that they can understand how it might be good for them?</p>
<p>Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways: (3 paragraphs)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Work toward developing a standard for certifying the level of privacy compliance for IoT devices. - Develop a database of best and worst practices for policy development and implementation that is a cross-country effort involving both policy makers and technologists.