

# IGF 2014

## Chair's Summary

Connecting Continents for Enhanced Multistakeholder Internet Governance

• *2-5 September 2014, Istanbul, Turkey* •

- <http://www.intgovforum.org> • <http://www.youtube.com/user/igf> •
- <https://twitter.com/intgovforum> •
- <https://www.facebook.com/IntGovForum> •

# Executive Summary

## The Road to IGF 2014

2014 is an important year for the future of international Internet and Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) policy, with a large number of high-level meetings and significant developments emerging throughout the year. With the WSIS Tunis Agenda having given the IGF the mandate to discuss emerging Internet governance issues, IGF 2014 has been able to play a role in facilitating timely policy debates at a key moment in the Internet governance landscape.

### Key Facts:

- The preparatory work of the IGF 2014 was guided by the recommendations of the Commission for Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum, that were recognised by the United Nations General Assembly in December 2013.
- The IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) held two face-to-face meetings (preceded by open consultations) and seven online meetings to help prepare for the ninth IGF. Minutes of all the MAG meetings are available [online](#).
- The community submitted 208 workshop proposals, which were examined and rated according to criteria developed by the MAG.

### Innovations in programming to this year's IGF include:

- A call for inputs from the community from the MAG Chair was made to collect inputs on actions taken by stakeholders as a result of participation at the IGF;
- Five best practice forums;
- Chair's report to suggest inter-sessional work modalities.

### Program highlights include:

- Net Neutrality main session - organised in response to the invitation by NETmundial;
- A debate on the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) stewardship transition - organised to gather inputs from a wide range of Internet governance community members on the process for replacing the current stewardship arrangement;
- Best practice forums on key Internet governance issues, building on community input.

All interested stakeholders are encouraged to visit the IGF website for full transcripts of all the main sessions and workshops that took place throughout the week at the ninth IGF. The IGF YouTube channel also contains videos of the sessions.

Reports from the organisers of workshops and other events are available on the IGF website:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2014/session-reports>

Those who participated in Istanbul or remotely are encouraged to fill out the following evaluation forms to provide feedback after the IGF 2014 and to suggest improvements for future meetings:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2014-workshop-evaluation-form>

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2014-evaluation-survey>

## From Dialogue to Action

Participants discussed and proposed possible ways forward on a number of topics discussed over the four-day IGF 2014:

### The Internet Governance Forum Beyond 2014

A multistakeholder group of participants drafted a statement to send to the United Nations (UN) to request a renewal of the IGF mandate and a longer cycle for each mandate given to the IGF. Discussion on the draft will continue online at <http://igfcontinuation.org>.

### National and Regional IGFs

Some participants, including a number of representatives of the national and regional IGF initiatives, suggested that there should be increased cross-fertilisation between the growing network of national and regional IGFs and the global IGF.

### IGF 2014 Best Practice Forums

Drawing together the knowledge, wisdom, and expertise of stakeholders, the best practice forums produced draft best practices documents on:

- Developing Meaningful Multistakeholder Mechanisms;
- Regulation and Mitigation of Unwanted Communications (Spam);
- Establishing and Supporting CERTs for Internet Security;
- Creating an Enabling Environment for the Development of Local Content;
- Online Child Safety and Protection.

### Network Neutrality

Recommendations were made on how the debate on network neutrality can be taken forward. As this year's deliberations were aimed at fostering a common understanding of the issues, it was indicated that next year's IGF is expected to feature a more developed discussion.

The concept of zero-rating was heavily discussed, with some speakers in favour of the practice, while others criticised its usage, and opinions were highly divergent between developing and developed country perspectives. While opinion lay mostly divided on the optimal network neutrality framework for enhancing the economic implications of the Internet, there were indeed

shared values on the importance of enhancing users' experience.

### Human Rights

Organisers from a selection of the almost fifty workshops at IGF 2014 that focused – directly or indirectly – on human rights issues met for a roundtable and endorsed a message document to be brought to the Human Rights Council panel on Privacy in the Digital Age on 12 September 2014.

Roundtable participants also recognised a maturity of discussions on human rights at the IGF and recommended that a new best practice forum on the protection of privacy in the digital age begin work in the lead-up to IGF 2015 in Brazil, making use of regional and national IGFs to ensure the inclusion of developing country participants.

### Policies Enabling Access, Growth and Development on the Internet

To facilitate the connection of the next five billion currently not connected, a strong call was made for an increased emphasis and inclusion of ICTs and Internet access in the post-2015 development agenda of the UN, as a catalyst for economic growth.

### Enhancing Digital Trust

Many participants emphasized that there is a need for increased interaction between government entities and all other interested stakeholders in ongoing and future deliberations on enhancing trust in cyberspace.

A synthesis of the discussions will be submitted to the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) special event “Implementing the Post-2015 Development Agenda: Enhancing access to and security of ICTs” on 18 November 2014.

### A Message From Youth

Youth representatives emphasized the need to strengthen existing mechanisms that empower youth in attending and engaging in the Internet governance ecosystem.

## **Announcements, Launches and Other Highlights of IGF 2014**

A number of IGF stakeholders made important announcements to the community and launched initiatives that will be taken forward into the broader Internet governance ecosystem. Below are a selection of announcements, launches and other highlights of the week.

### **• Pre-conference •**

#### **High Level Leaders Meeting**

The host country convened a high level meeting on the topic of ‘Capacity Building for Economic Development’. Thirty-three high level leaders, including a deputy prime minister, ministers, deputy-ministers, representatives of international organisations, presidents of regulatory bodies, leaders of entities from civil society, the private sector and the technical community spoke on this important topic.

#### **Internet Governance Forum Support Association**

The Internet Society formally launched the Internet Governance Forum Support Association (IGFSA). The main objective of the association is to achieve a stable and sustainable funding mechanism to contribute to the United Nations IGF Trust Fund and support related activities. More information is available at <http://www.igfsa.org>.

#### **NETmundial: Looking Back, Learning Lessons and Mapping the Road Ahead**

During this day-long follow-up event to the NETmundial in Sao Paulo, an interactive session worked to create a roadmap for institutional improvements to the global Internet governance ecosystem. This event also launched a book, titled [Beyond NETmundial: The Roadmap for Institutional Improvements to the Global Internet Governance Ecosystem](#).

### **• DAY One •**

#### **Enhancing ICANN Accountability and Governance Town Hall Meeting**

This meeting provided an opportunity for an open dialogue to address and clarify any concerns regarding to enhancing ICANN’s accountability and governance process.

#### **WSIS+10 High-Level Event Information Session**

This session, organised by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), on the World Summit on the Information Society High-level Event provided an opportunity for the IGF community to learn more about the outcomes of the event and its implications for the broader ecosystem.

### **• DAY Two •**

#### **CSTD Ten-year Review of WSIS**

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), which performs the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) secretariat function, is currently facilitating the CSTD’s ten-year review of the progress made in the implementation of the WSIS outcomes, as mandated by the Economic and Social Council. UNCTAD encouraged IGF participants to contribute to through an online questionnaire at <http://unctad.org/en/Pages/CSTD/WSIS-10yearReview.aspx>.

• **DAY Three** •

**UNESCO’s Comprehensive Study on the Internet**

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation asked stakeholders in Istanbul to contribute to its Internet study which covers issues related to access to information and knowledge, freedom of expression, privacy and ethical dimensions of the information society. UNESCO encouraged all IGF participants to contribute to the study, which is open for comments until **30 November 2014**. The study is available at <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/crosscutting-priorities/unesco-internet-study>.

**African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedoms**

The declaration, which is a Pan-African initiative to promote human rights standards and openness principles in Internet-policy making on the continent, was launched at the 2014 IGF. The declaration is available at <http://africaninternetrights.org>.

• **DAY Four** •

**ITU and UNICEF Guidelines for Industry on Child Online Protection**

The International Telecommunications Union and the United Nations Children’s Fund released the updated version of the Guidelines for Industry on Child Online Protection. The Guidelines provide advice on how the ICT industry can work to help ensure children’s safety when using the Internet or any of the associated technologies or devices that can connect to it. The guidelines are available at <http://www.itu.int/en/cop/Pages/guidelines.aspx>.

**Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability Accessibility Guidelines**

The Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability (DCAD) approved the “DCAD Accessibility Guidelines 2014: Accessibility and Disability in IGF Meetings”. The guidelines are meant to be a living document and are an update of DCAD’s previous guidelines. The document was formally presented during the taking stock main/focus session as an output document of the ninth IGF meeting. The guidelines are available at <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/dynamic-coalitions/dynamic-coalition-on-accessibility-and-disability/258-igf-2014-dcad-accessibility-guidelines-final-v5/file>.

**Key IGF 2014 Statistics**

• 2,403 onsite participants • 1,291 remote participants • 144 countries represented

**Onsite Participation by Region**

Africa	190
Asia Pacific	405
Eastern Europe	133
Host Country	745
Latin America and the Caribbean	150
Western Europe and Others	780

**Onsite Participation by Stakeholder Group**

Civil Society	779
Government	571
Intergovernmental	96
Organisations	
Private Sector	581
Technical Community	266
Media	110

# Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Why IGF 2014 is Different from Past IGFs .....	7
1.2 The Road to IGF 2014 .....	7
<b>2. From Dialogue to Action .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 The Internet Governance Forum Beyond 2014.....	9
2.2 National and Regional IGFs .....	9
2.3 IGF 2014 Best Practice Forums .....	9
2.4 IGF Dynamic Coalitions .....	10
2.5 Network Neutrality.....	10
2.6 Human Rights .....	10
2.7 Policies Enabling Access, Growth and Development on the Internet.....	11
2.8 Enhancing Digital Trust .....	11
2.9 A Message From Youth.....	12
<b>3. Extended Summary of the Meeting.....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1. Statistics on Participation .....	13
3.2 Main/Focus Sessions .....	14
3.3 Announcements, Launches and Other Highlights of IGF 2014.....	23
<b>4. The Road to IGF 2015.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>5. Annexes.....</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1 List of Workshops, Dynamic Coalitions, Open Forums and Other Sessions.....	29
5.2 Best Practice Forums' Executive Summaries .....	34
5.3 Recommendation to the UN General Assembly for an Open Ended Mandate of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF).....	45
5.4 Message to the United Nations Human Rights Council from the Roundtable for Organisers of Workshops on Enhancing Digital Trust and the Internet and Human Rights .....	47

# 1. Introduction

The ninth Internet Governance Forum (IGF) took place from 2 to 5 September 2014 in Istanbul, Turkey. More than 2000 onsite participants from all continents representing different stakeholder groups (governments, intergovernmental organisations, private sector, civil society and technical community) participated in this annual international gathering exclusively devoted to Internet governance. Several hundred more stakeholders participated remotely through a global network of remote hubs. As well as onsite participation and remote participation, social networking platforms such as Flickr, Facebook, Twitter and Tumblr were widely used by participants.

## 1.1 Why IGF 2014 is Different from Past IGFs

The ninth IGF aimed to actively link with other Internet governance processes and respond to the [NETmundial Multistakeholder Statement of Sao Paulo](#) in a variety of ways, by both taking forward the suggested issues for further discussion and by improving its outcomes.

Innovations to this year's IGF were:

- A call for inputs from the community from the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Chair was made to collect inputs on actions taken by stakeholders as a result of participation at the IGF. A [summary of the inputs](#) received was published prior to the meeting.
- The creation of five best practice forums to document current best practices on five challenging issues facing Internet governance today. For more information, see Section 3.3 and Annex 5.2 of this Chair's Summary. Stakeholders were invited to contribute to the rolling documents on the IGF website.
- A revitalisation of the format and content of the Chair's Summary to suggest inter-sessional work modalities for the IGF and to make the IGF outcomes and outputs more portable and visible, so that they can be taken forward, as appropriate and on voluntary basis, by relevant Internet governance bodies, institutions and organisations.

## 1.2 The Road to IGF 2014

2014 is an important year for the future of international Internet and Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) policy, with a large number of high-level meetings and significant developments emerging throughout the year. With the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) [Tunis Agenda for the Information Society](#) having given the IGF the mandate to discuss emerging Internet governance issues, IGF 2014 has been able to play a role in facilitating timely policy debates at a key moment in the Internet governance landscape.

Key facts:

- The preparatory work of the IGF 2014 was guided by the recommendations of the Commission for Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum, that were recognised by the United Nations General Assembly in December 2013.
- The IGF MAG held two face-to-face meetings, preceded by open consultations and seven online meetings. Minutes of the all MAG meetings are available [online](#).
- The community submitted 208 workshop proposals, which were examined and rated according to criteria developed by the MAG.

The ninth IGF was related with other Internet governance processes such as the outcomes of the NETmundial meeting and the ongoing discussions of the WSIS review, the International

Telecommunication Union (ITU), and the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, among many others.

## **Matching Challenges and Problems with Solutions and Policy Options**

To identify the issues and challenges faced by the global, multistakeholder IGF community, programming for the ninth IGF began immediately after the close of the eighth IGF in Bali. The IGF put out a call for general reflections on the Bali meeting and suggestions and ideas for issues to be discussed in Istanbul. The main theme and sub-themes of IGF 2014 were developed in a bottom-up manner by taking these inputs, ideas and suggestions into account.

### **Themes of IGF 2014**

The **overarching theme** for the 2014 IGF, derived by consensus of the MAG together with all IGF stakeholders, was:

- Connecting Continents for Enhanced Multistakeholder Internet Governance

**Sub-themes** of IGF 2014 were:

- Policies Enabling Access
- Content Creation, Dissemination and Use
- Internet as an Engine for Growth and Development
- IGF and The Future of the Internet Ecosystem
- Enhancing Digital Trust
- Internet and Human Rights
- Critical Internet Resources
- Emerging Issues

### **Programming**

To bring the appropriate workshops to the ninth IGF to discuss possible solutions and policy options for current Internet governance challenges, the sub-themes were used to inform the initial call for workshop proposals, with potential workshop organisers asked to categorise their sessions under one of the themes, to the extent possible. This process helped the MAG to ensure that the more than 80 workshops selected for IGF 2014 were those most focussed on finding solutions and policy options for the challenges and questions posed by the community.

To prepare the substance of the main sessions, a call was made to the IGF community to seek their inputs on policy questions to be addressed during the sessions.



## 2. From Dialogue to Action

Participants discussed and proposed possible ways forward on a number of topics discussed over the four-day IGF 2014:

### 2.1 The Internet Governance Forum Beyond 2014

The second five-year mandate of the IGF ends in 2015. The possible extension of the IGF's mandate may be discussed by the United Nations (UN) General Assembly later this year. In response to this, a multistakeholder group of participants drafted a statement to send to the UN to **request a renewal of the IGF mandate and a longer cycle for each mandate given to the IGF**. A copy of the draft request is also attached as Annex 5.3 of this Chair's Summary. Discussion on the draft will continue online at <http://igfcontinuation.org>.

### 2.2 National and Regional IGFs

Some participants, including a number of representatives of the national and regional IGF initiatives, suggested that **there should be increased cross-fertilisation between the growing network of national and regional IGFs and the global IGF**. Many suggested that various national and regional initiatives in the coming year might take up some issues and contribute to the IGF inter-sessional work leading to the tenth IGF in Brazil.

### 2.3 IGF 2014 Best Practice Forums

An innovation to the IGF format in 2014, the inaugural five best practice forums worked inter-sessionally, beginning in May 2014, to **develop five draft best practice documents** that have drawn on the knowledge, wisdom and expertise of stakeholders to provide useful insights to the whole Internet community on:

- Developing Meaningful Multistakeholder Mechanisms;
- Regulation and Mitigation of Unwanted Communications (Spam);
- Establishing and Supporting CERTs for Internet Security;
- Creating an Enabling Environment for the Development of Local Content;
- Online Child Safety and Protection.

All stakeholders were encouraged to **contribute and comment on the draft best practice documents** at <http://review.intgovforum.org/igf2014>. It is envisaged that work on some of the topics will continue inter-sessionally into 2015.

It was said by many participants **that the practice of holding Best Practice Forums should continue during the 2015 preparatory cycle**.

Attached as Annex 5.2 to this Chair's Summary are the five executive summaries of the best practice forums' outcome documents.

## 2.4 IGF Dynamic Coalitions

Many participants suggested that one core element in strengthening the IGF is to address the roles and responsibilities of the dynamic coalitions. There was a view that there was a **need for a process to enable the entire IGF community to participate in and validate the findings of the dynamic coalitions.**

It was also recommended that **dynamic coalitions could lead some of the inter-sessional IGF work and be better included in programme development for IGF meetings.**

## 2.5 Network Neutrality

Discussions on network neutrality looked at the issue from a range of different perspectives:

- Technical;
- Economic;
- Social and human rights;
- Two cross-cutting perspectives:
  - Developmental;
  - Regulatory.

The discussions showed that all these issues are intertwined and multifaceted. Given the differences between developing and developed country perspectives, there was a sense that the search for a “one size fits all” policy solution would not be the best way to proceed globally. While there was a divergence of views on many issues, such as the concept of appropriate network management and the impact on innovation or zero-rating, there was also convergence of views on the importance of enhancing users' experience or the need to avoid the blocking of legal content.

The ninth IGF concluded with looking at the role of the IGF in taking the network neutrality discussion forward. The discussions had shown that the IGF, as a genuine multistakeholder platform, was a suitable place to look at this complex issue from all the different perspectives. **The Dynamic Coalition on Network Neutrality will continue the discussions leading up to the 2015 meeting, but the view was also held that there was a need to develop a process that allowed the entire IGF community to weigh in and validate the findings of the Dynamic Coalition.**

## 2.6 Human Rights

Organisers from a selection of the almost fifty workshops at IGF 2014 that focused – directly or indirectly – on human rights issues met for a roundtable and **endorsed a message document to be brought to the Human Rights Council panel on Privacy in the Digital Age on 12 September 2014.** A copy of the message is attached as Annex 5.4 of this Chair's Summary.

Roundtable participants also recognised a maturity of discussions on human rights at the IGF and **recommended that a new best practice forum on the protection of privacy in the digital age begin work in the lead-up to IGF 2015 in Brazil,** making use of regional and national IGFs to ensure the inclusion of developing country participants.

## 2.7 Policies Enabling Access, Growth and Development on the Internet

To facilitate the connection of the next five billion currently without access, a strong call was made to **increase the emphasis and inclusion of ICTs and Internet access in the post-2015 development agenda of the UN** as a catalyst for economic growth.

Many participants stressed that enabling access should be a concern for all who are part of the Internet community. It was said that while there are certainly challenges in both hemispheres, **through perseverance and learning from mistakes and embracing best practices, we can reach the goal of bringing every person on the planet broadband access to the Internet.**

Discussions were also held on existing methodologies for calculating levels of Internet penetration and the need to improve, and, possibly, standardise such methodologies, by bringing together experiences from all stakeholders.

Another issue that was highlighted was that **broadband access should be recognised as a universal right and key to digital social inclusion.** This was considered to be especially important for users with disabilities and marginalised groups, and for promoting multilingualism.

## 2.8 Enhancing Digital Trust

Many participants emphasized that there is a need to **increase interaction between government entities and all other interested stakeholders in ongoing and future deliberations on enhancing trust in cyberspace.**

Many sessions throughout the week that dealt with issues of child online safety emphasized that it is possible to protect both children's safety and their rights, though sometimes the two can be at odds with each other. Still, **by providing education and adhering to the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child, stakeholders can increase both the safety of children and youth and their rights to freedom of expression, privacy and participation.**

The consensus of stakeholders involved in the best practice forum on online child protection was that **IGF work on enhancing digital trust should integrate related work by the ITU, the European Commission and similar organisations. This consolidated effort could then be extended and the forum can reconvene at the 2015 IGF in Brazil.**

Other workshops emphasized the need for increased multistakeholder discussions and decision making around issues such as Domain Name System (DNS) security and national sovereignty, protection of privacy and personal data and law enforcement access, intellectual property rights protection, mitigation of malicious activities and attacks.

**A synthesis of the various discussions on enhancing digital trust that took place during the ninth IGF will be submitted as a background paper to "Implementing the Post-2015 Development Agenda: Enhancing access to and security of ICTs", a special event taking place during the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) Coordination and Management Meeting, 17-18 November 2014.**

## 2.9 A Message From Youth

Youth representatives emphasized the need to **strengthen existing mechanisms that empower youth in attending and engaging in the Internet governance ecosystem.**

One key finding regarding youth from related workshops and other sessions was that intercultural understanding is becoming a core characteristic of citizenship (both online and offline) in the networked world and Internet access should be a key affordance, if not right, of citizens of all ages worldwide, because - without it - both participation and access to information are limited.

Youth participants and other supportive stakeholders stated that all youth efforts to gain full stakeholder-level participation at the IGF need to be better recognised. As the intended beneficiaries of policymaking and as expert users of connected technology, youth are needed in all processes that aim to benefit them.

### 3. Extended Summary of the Meeting

The following section provides a more detailed summary of the proceedings of the ninth IGF. All interested stakeholders are also encouraged to visit the IGF website for full transcripts and videos from the sessions.

Reports from the organisers of workshops and other events are also available on the IGF website at:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2014/session-reports>

A full list of workshops, open forums and other sessions is also attached as Annex 5.1 of this Chair's Summary.

#### 3.1 Statistics on Participation

- 2,403 onsite participants
- 1,291 remote participants
- 144 countries represented

##### Onsite Participation by Region

Africa	190
Asia Pacific	405
Eastern Europe	133
Host Country	745
Latin America and the Caribbean	150
Western Europe and Others	780

##### Onsite Participation by Stakeholder Group

Civil Society	779
Government	571
Intergovernmental	96
Organisations	
Private Sector	581
Technical Community	266
Media	110

- 135 sessions
- 14 pre-events

Twitter messages using the hashtag, #IGF2014, reached more than 4 million people each day.

## 3.2 Main/Focus Sessions

### • DAY 1 •

#### **Setting the Scene: Topical Insight and Debate Related to the Subthemes of IGF 2014**

On the morning of Day One, immediately following the orientation session, participants convened for an interactive “Setting the Scene” dialogue that provided topical insight and debate related to the sub-themes of the IGF. The session allowed stakeholders to review the overall programme and decide which sessions they would like to attend to get the most out of their IGF experience. Experts from all stakeholder groups provided unique insights into the main themes of the meeting and also previewed the main sessions and other key sessions that would take place.

#### **Opening Ceremony**

Mr. Thomas Gass, Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs of United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), formally opened the ninth IGF. Mr. Gass stressed that the United Nations Secretary General was committed to the multistakeholder model for Internet governance championed by the IGF and the long-term sustainability of the forum.

Mr. Gass emphasized the importance of ensuring that the global Internet is one that promotes peace and security, enables development and ensures human rights. As the international community strives to accelerate the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals by 2015, and as it shapes the Post-2015 Development Agenda that focuses on sustainable development, expanding the benefits of ICTs, through a global, interoperable and robust Internet, will be crucial.

Mr. Tayfun Acarer, Chairman of the Board and President of the Information and Communication Technologies Authority (ICTA) of the Republic of Turkey, expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to host the ninth IGF in Istanbul and stressed the importance of enabling access to information resources in helping to bridge the digital divide.

His Excellency Lütfi Elvan, Minister of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications of the Republic of Turkey, assumed the role of chair of the meeting, welcomed all participants and explained that with more than 61 million Internet users and over 71 million mobile subscriptions in Turkey, the Turkish Government is proud of what they have achieved in enabling access to so many of its citizens in a short period of time. His Excellency, Mr. Elvan, also suggested an “Internet Universal Declaration” be prepared in a multistakeholder fashion as an additional concrete output of the IGF. After his speech, His Excellency Mr. Elvan conveyed the role of chair to Mr. Acarer.

#### **Opening Session**

The IGF plays a vital role in addressing key issues of Internet governance. Many speakers during the Opening Session noted that much had evolved in the broader Internet governance landscape since the eighth IGF meeting in Bali. The confluence of current events and the large number of high-level meetings on the calendar make 2014 potentially a seminal moment for the

future of international Internet and ICT policy, with the IGF being at the heart of these major policy debates.

His Excellency Lütü Elvan, Minister of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications of Turkey, highlighted that since the first IGF many things have changed in the telecommunications sector and many strides have been made. The IGF continues to serve as a unique and invaluable platform for discussing both long-standing and emerging Internet governance issues.

Many speakers made an urgent call to strengthen the IGF and provide it with further financial and political sustainability to safeguard the progress that has been made in creating an ecosystem where the Internet can go on flourishing in the future.

There are significant opportunities to advance globalisation and strengthen international multistakeholder cooperation. The Internet is a multi-faceted economic and social space that has become the central nervous system of the information society. Major policy debates throughout the world are taking place around issues such as network neutrality, data protection, big data and the protection of children online. The Internet economy is contributing from 5 to 9% of total economic growth in developing markets and 15 to 25% per year in developed markets.

The Internet's enormous impact on economic growth makes it critical that policies and practices are adopted and implemented to insure its future viability. It was said by many that the ninth IGF thus could not have come at a more apt time, as the multistakeholder approach, which brings together government policy makers, businesses, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and Internet experts on an equal footing, can effectively contribute toward overcoming today's challenges and preserve the Internet's future.

Mr. Virgilio Fernandes Almeida, National Secretary for Information Technology Policies at the Brazilian Ministry of Science and Technology, invited all participants to the tenth IGF in 2015 hosted by Brazil, and highlighted that the IGF serves as a unique and invaluable platform for discussing a wide range of Internet governance issues. He emphasized that the IGF has proven its usefulness by providing policy questions on Internet governance issues and reiterated the need to strengthen the Forum and provide it with financial and political sustainability.

## • DAY 2 •

### **Policies Enabling Access, Growth and Development on the Internet**

#### *Context:*

There were 1 billion Internet users when the Tunis Agenda was adopted, in 2005. Nine years later, there are approx. 7 billion mobile subscriptions and approx. 3 billion Internet users. Home Internet access is near saturation in developed countries, but only 31% in developing countries. Public Internet access, infrastructure sharing and access as a human right for the socially disadvantaged, vulnerable sections and persons with disabilities are critical access issues – that need global attention.

#### *Summary:*

The session discussed Internet economic growth from a developing countries' perspective, and policies to maximize the benefits from the use of Internet globally. The session stressed the immense impact that Internet penetration can have on growth and development and the

urgency to work collaboratively towards bridging the digital divide, as nearly 60% of the world's population have yet to get access to the Internet and only 44% of the world's households are connected.

One of the main objectives of the session was to strengthen the IGF's knowledge agenda by bringing forth diverse experiences, especially from developing countries, on policies that have worked to deliver access, and learnings on how Internet connectivity drives growth and development in developing countries especially for women, youth and marginalised groups.

The session had a roundtable set-up and invited 22 speakers, 13 of which were from developing countries and two from international organisations. It was noted that nearly half the participants were women.

The highlights of the interactive discussion included:

- Many stressed that the concerns over Internet access and inclusivity goes beyond the connectivity and infrastructure issues, but also incorporates the role of social inclusion in the debate, including users with disabilities and marginalised groups.
- One speaker noted that there is an important and complex relationship between access to networks, the development of local content and information knowledge flows. This was echoed in comments from the floor, which acknowledged that there was a strong correlation between growth in local content and the development of network infrastructure, and that open government and open data policies around the world provided strong examples of how developers in the public arena are able to leverage the public to generate new information society services. It was also noted that the availability of local content is a key driver of Internet adoption. The need to place more emphasis on multilingualism online was also acknowledged by the panel.
- Participants recognised the value of cohesive educational systems as carriers of appropriate skills starting at primary school level - for example, coding.
- It was agreed by many on the panel that broadening the Internet governance discussion would enable other sectors and empower the multistakeholder model. This included finding ways to involve local and small enterprises in the policy discussion. It was stated that this aimed to help inclusiveness to the ecosystem, and at the same time empower such entities. One speaker also noted that the significance of youth empowerment in the policy formation debate is imperative in spurring economic and social development.
- The importance of standardising how access levels are calculated was noted. It was argued that there are many different ways to do this, and views were expressed both in favour of more standardisation and more local context sensitivity. It was suggested that an action to take from the session is to do more work looking at the different methodologies for calculating access levels and providing more transparency for these debates.
- Digital competencies and media literacy were seen by many participants as essential to Internet growth. It was noted that policies on the integration of digital competencies and media literacy in the formal and informal and life-long learning systems are integral to growth.
- It was agreed that the involvement of governments in promoting and supporting infrastructure expansion through planning was imperative; however, there were differences in opinion about how the implementation of these plans should be monitored.



## Network Neutrality: Towards a Common Understanding of a Complex Issue

### *Context:*

Network neutrality was one of the most polemic issues, as was also witnessed at NETmundial in April 2014. At NETmundial there were “diverging views as to whether or not to include the specific term as a principle in the outcomes”. However, NETmundial participants agreed on the need to continue the discussion regarding network neutrality and recommended this discussion “be addressed at forums such as the IGF”. The NETmundial Multistakeholder Statement of Sao Paulo set up a useful framework for further discussions of net neutrality:

“Net neutrality: [...] It is important that we continue the discussion of the Open Internet including how to enable freedom of expression, competition, consumer choice, meaningful transparency and appropriate network management and recommend that this be addressed at forums such as the next IGF.”

### *Summary:*

The session looked at the issue from different perspectives – technical, economic, social and human rights as well as two cross-cutting perspectives, developmental and regulatory. The discussions showed that all these issues are intertwined and multifaceted. Given the differences between developing and developed country perspectives, there was a sense that the search for a one-size fits all policy solution would not be the best way to proceed globally. While there was a divergence of views on many issues, such as the concept of appropriate network management, the impact on innovation or zero-rating, there were also convergence of views on the importance of enhancing users’ experience or the need to avoid the blocking of legal content.

The first segment of the session explored the technical aspects of network neutrality. Discussants spoke about the growing technical complexities of network neutrality as an introduction to the issue. Speakers explored concepts of network management, open Internet and common carrier law. However, given the geographical diversity of discussants and their different perspectives, disagreement remained on definitions and priorities. Throughout the segment, it became evident that the technical aspect of network neutrality is intertwined with the economic and social nature of the issue, providing challenges to separate the issues. In the end, emphasis was put on the need to achieve a common understanding of certain concepts, while suggestions were made that regulators should be looking at “nimble rules” that are flexible for future actions and unseen circumstances.

The second segment focused on the economic aspects, leading to a lively and diverse debate. Much of the conversation centred on balancing the need to support innovation on the Internet, while still being able to foster affordable access and investment. The concept of zero-rating was intensely discussed, with some speakers in favour of the practice, while others criticized its usage, and opinions were highly divergent between developing and developed country perspectives. While opinion lay mostly divided on the optimal network neutrality framework for enhancing the economic implications of the Internet, participants shared the view that enhancing users’ experience was an important aspect in the debate.

Human rights implications of network neutrality made up the last segment of the session. Speakers opened the segment by discussing the impact of network management on human rights principles, stating that it may be unreasonable to define appropriate network management. Blocking and throttling of legal content by network providers were raised as practices that should be avoided. There was convergence in the room that there should not be blocking or throttling of legal content and that transparency may be needed to ensure user protection. Again, many different approaches were raised, from legislation to developing country perspectives.

The session concluded with looking at the role of the IGF in taking the discussion forward. The discussion had shown that the IGF was a genuine multistakeholder platform that was a suitable place to look at this complex issue from all the different perspectives. The Dynamic Coalition on Network Neutrality will continue the discussions leading up to the 2015 meeting, but the view was also held that there was a need to develop a process that allowed the entire IGF community to weigh in and validate the findings of the Dynamic Coalition.

### • DAY 3 •

## **Evolution of the Internet Governance Ecosystem and the Role of the IGF**

### *Context:*

As the Internet continues to grow and its benefits reach more people, more stakeholders are entering the Internet governance debates, with the aim to address concerns they have about the use and potential misuse of the Internet. Existing organisations, such as UN agencies, upon request by the governments, examine their roles in relation to Internet-related issues while newer organisations that follow more of a “bottom up” governance approach, such as the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), now co-exist alongside intergovernmental organisations. In addition, since 2006, the IGF has been a platform for stakeholders to come together on an equal footing to discuss, exchange ideas and share good practices with each other. While many are embracing the engagement of stakeholders more directly in decisions and governance, others remain concerned that more intergovernmental involvement in the Internet is needed, especially on public policy issues. This main session was planned at an important point in the discussions about Internet governance, with numerous Internet governance-related meetings being held in 2013 and 2014 and the current mandate of the IGF due to expire in 2015.

### *Summary:*

Participants recognised the growth of interest in Internet governance since the World Summit on the Information Society. In particular, participants drew attention to the recent growth in the number of regional and national IGFs and initiatives such as NETmundial as examples of increasing interest in the issues that the Internet has raised. One participant noted that NETmundial had codified many principles for the Internet governance ecosystem and that the same ecosystem also had the possibility of documenting relationships and commitments among its interacting parties. Another participant stated that the community could not afford to keep spending time discussing Internet governance processes but, instead, had to deliver on implementation - that multistakeholderism had to not just be a principle to follow but must also deliver results. In contrast, a different participant suggested that it would be naive to believe that the multistakeholder approach was the most effective way and that governments had an important role to play in Internet-related public policy.

One participant noted that no technical issue was devoid of public policy implications and, similarly, no Internet policy could be framed without a deeper understanding of the technical issues of the underlying Internet infrastructure. NETmundial and the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) stewardship transition were noted as signs that Internet governance had reached a pivotal moment in its development. One speaker reported that, while not perfect, NETmundial had been one of the most open Internet governance formats he had ever experienced, and the challenge was to feed the outcomes of such discussions into larger political processes on an equal footing.

The fact that the Internet ecosystem had a distributed nature was explained as a consequence of the nature of the Internet itself. Moreover, the issues that the Internet generates are themselves

distributed. It was noted that this distributed ecosystem was necessary to ensure that any governance, ideas or structures could ensure the Internet and its governance could be extended to include areas and people where it was currently not present. In response, another participant noted that the challenge facing Internet governance today was very much the same one as that faced during the WSIS process (2003-2005): how to ensure that the constellation of actors and forums could work together and benefit more from each other. It was noted that while there were around 2,400 people in Istanbul, there were billions of people still not at the table, particularly from developing countries, and that these stakeholders needed to be able to contribute. There was also wide agreement that all stakeholder groups had an important role to play in Internet governance.

It was also noted that it was important to ensure that the Internet kept evolving and growing and that the next unborn innovator would have the opportunity to use this great invention of mankind. The globalisation of the Internet was raised, with one speaker suggesting that the trans-border nature of the Internet was having serious geopolitical ramifications, with some states seeking to “protect” themselves from the Internet for political and economic reasons. To address such fears, the speaker continued, it was important to ensure that Internet governance mechanisms were truly global.

A speaker noted that the many Internet governance related discussions that had been taking place, such as WSIS+10, the World Telecommunications/ICT Policy Forum, and the IGF were each contributing to moving the Internet governance discussion forward and to improving stakeholders’ understanding.

In summarising this part of the discussion, one of the moderators concluded that it was clear from the discussions that Internet governance was about shades of grey rather than black and white, and that evolution was needed, not revolution.

A UN agency representative stated that it considered the IGF to be one of the most important WSIS outcomes. A first time attendee from a developing country reported that they were impressed with the open nature of the IGF, with no barriers to entry and open expression of opinions by all. A panellist stated that the national and regional IGFs were seen as an important grass roots movement that enabled local communities to discuss Internet governance issues closest to them. It was also noted that while it was important for Internet governance issues to be discussed locally, it was essential for issues to return to the global IGF for cross-regional discussion. An example of where this format of localised and global discussion was working well was the network neutrality debate that was being discussed at IGF 2014 and would return for the following IGF. The same speaker noted that where IGF had not been able to have significant impact to date was on sensitive issues such as surveillance, censorship, blocking and filtering.

A speaker from government stated that the IGF was an important “one stop shop” for stakeholders who were unable to participate in the many Internet governance discussions that took place every year. Another government representative suggested that, after nine years of discussing issues at IGF, it was time to think about implementation.

In terms of ways to evolve the IGF, more than one participant called for regular UN budget funding of the IGF so the forum could achieve more. Another participant encouraged IGF to begin making recommendations on Internet governance issues. However, another speaker suggested that negotiated outcomes would be “the death of the IGF” and that rather than “haggling over the placement of a comma” it was more important that the IGF facilitate well-informed decision-making.

A representative from civil society encouraged IGF participants to join an initiative to send a statement to the UN encouraging the General Assembly to renew the IGF mandate (see Section 2, “From Dialogue to Action,” of this Chair’s Summary for more information).

One of the session moderators wrapped up, noting that the key terms used in the discussion about IGF had been: openness, accountability, sharing ideas, comprehensiveness, inclusiveness, equal footing, concession, capacity building, best practices, education and outcome document. He encouraged everyone to contribute to the preparations for IGF 2015.

*Ways Forward/ Recommendations:*

- There was a suggestion to take the knowledge, expertise and passion about the Internet and how it is governed to other communities and to encourage them to engage in Internet governance.
- There was also a suggestion to take the learning captured from IGFs back to other forums discussing Internet governance issues.
- A number of participants stressed the importance of regional and national IGFs in both strengthening the IGF and encouraging more stakeholders to participate in Internet governance.
- There was strong consensus that the IGF's mandate should be renewed beyond 2015.
- It was suggested that there needed to be stable and sustainable funding for the IGF.
- One speaker suggested a way forward for inter-sessional work for the IGF: one or two key Internet governance issues at a reasonable state of maturity be selected to be worked on in parallel with the IGF open consultations in 2015 and then brought to the IGF in Brazil.
- One participant suggested that in addition to the IGF MAG, which focused on preparing for the meeting, it could be useful to have an IGF "multistakeholder council" or steering committee that focused on IGF outputs.

• Day 4 •

**IANA Functions: NTIA's Stewardship Transition and ICANN's Accountability Process**

*Context:*

This topical session was a response to two developments in the first half of 2014: 1) the announcement by the United States National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) in March 2014 to transition its stewardship of the IANA function to the global multistakeholder community; and 2) prompted by that announcement, a call by many in the ICANN community to examine ICANN's accountability in the absence of its historical contractual relationship with the United States Government. Both these issues also appeared in the NETmundial Multistakeholder Statement of Sao Paulo as issues with relevance to the broader Internet governance ecosystem. The aim of the session was to help participants gain a better understanding on the two interrelated processes of IANA stewardship transition and ICANN accountability.

*Summary:*

The session began with an overview of the three main functions performed by IANA: the administration of:

- Internet protocol parameters;
- Internet addresses;
- Domain names.

It was noted that policy for these resources was not developed by IANA and that the stewardship of IANA involved verifying that the administrative procedures of the existing IANA functions were followed correctly. Not all participants agreed, however, that the stewardship transition had to limit itself to a narrow focus on replacing NTIA's stewardship role; some believed that the transition process could also examine issues surrounding the NTIA's role that would be affected by the NTIA's withdrawal from its stewardship role, such as NTIA's ability to award the IANA contract.

Members of the IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) - a group of representatives from a wide range of communities with an interest in IANA - explained they would be working to collate proposals developed by the communities with an interest in IANA into a single document that would then be sent to the NTIA, outlining how NTIA's stewardship could be replaced by a global multistakeholder model. The ICG plans to have proposals submitted by different sectors of the community by the end of December 2014, with the intention of having the new stewardship mechanism agreed to by the community and accepted by the NTIA and in place before the September 2015 date for the renewal of the IANA contract. It was also noted that there was a tension in reconciling the relative slowness of a multistakeholder process to develop the proposal and the desire to have a replacement stewardship model in place before the current US administration's term ended. It was reported that some of the communities have already begun work on developing proposals for a post-NTIA model of IANA stewardship.

It was explained that some were concerned that when NTIA was no longer the authority reassigning the IANA contract, some future ICANN Board may overstep its boundaries. The Affirmation of Commitments and ICANN Bylaws had been proposed as possible solutions to avoid such risks, but the Affirmation could be cancelled by either party - ICANN or the NTIA - upon notice and the Board could change the Bylaws. There was therefore discussion currently underway to find ways to enhance ICANN's accountability.

It was noted that one of the end goals of the accountability process should be to enhance the perception of legitimacy in ICANN, particularly by those who are not part of ICANN discussions. There was also a suggestion that while it was crucial to address ICANN accountability in terms of the effect it may have on a post-NTIA stewardship model, it was also important to look at the bigger picture of ICANN's accountability at the same time. The possibility of an oversight body that would monitor ICANN's accountability was raised, along with questions about how that body would, in turn, be held accountable for its actions. Another participant noted that because ICANN was always evolving, its accountability framework would always be evolving too, and that aiming for a perfect - and static - accountability framework was unrealistic.

#### *Ways Forward/Recommendations:*

- The process for developing a IANA stewardship transition proposal needs to be mindful of the importance to maintain the security, stability and resiliency of the Internet.
- IGF participants were encouraged to start participating directly in the various ICANN communities as soon as possible to help develop proposals for the IANA stewardship transition.
- It was noted that a truly multistakeholder process to develop a new IANA model could build further trust in the multistakeholder model of Internet governance.
- There was a suggestion to clarify where accountability with regards to the IANA stewardship transition and wider ICANN accountability converge or diverge.

## **Taking Stock and Open Microphone Sessions**

The traditional IGF Taking Stock session reflected on the main outputs of the IGF main sessions. Participants identified issues that could lend themselves to ongoing inter-sessional work and discussed appropriate ways to pursue this work. Some other overall suggestions were considered regarding the role of the IGF in the evolving Internet governance ecosystem.

It was stressed during this session and throughout the week that while the IGF structure and process is certainly effective and unique, there is opportunity to do more to revitalise and strengthen the IGF going forward. It was said that the capacity-building and knowledge-transfer made possible by the IGF and IGF national and regional initiatives must be increasingly more actionable, practical, portable and applicable. The community needs to be better at capturing the IGF learnings and making them accessible and applicable to a wider group of people. Case studies, best practices and capacity building on gaining the benefits of the digital opportunity, especially geared to developing countries, should also be prioritised in coming IGFs.

The Taking Stock session, together with the Open Microphone session, also allowed stakeholders to report on other major outcomes from the workshops or other sessions and to suggest inter-sessional activities for the community to take up in preparations for the 2015 IGF. Some of these suggestions are detailed in Section 3.3.

It was also reported that a group of MAG members spent some time during the meeting interviewing participants to get a better sense of the different experiences that stakeholders have and how the MAG and IGF Secretariat could improve these experiences in the future.

## **Closing Session**

In keeping with IGF tradition, several speakers, representing all stakeholder groups, addressed the Closing Session. Gratitude to the host country and all those who had participated and made the ninth IGF a success was expressed by everyone. Speakers reaffirmed the importance of the multistakeholder process and cooperation, and emphasized the importance of dialogue.

Mr. Vyacheslav Cherkasov, Senior Governance and Public Administration Officer of the Development Management Branch in the Division for Public Administration and Development Management, UNDESA, spoke on behalf of the department, and in his concluding remarks stressed the importance of participants and supporters of the IGF to reach out to their respective constituencies and communities to raise awareness about the renewal of the IGF mandate and the continuance of the IGF work.

In his concluding address, the Chair of the ninth IGF, Mr. Tayfun Acarer, Chairman of the Board and President of Information and Communication Technologies Authority of Turkey reiterated the call of His Excellency Lütü Elvan, Minister of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communication of Turkey regarding an “Internet Universal Declaration”, expressing that details related to this important issue needed to be studied in due course. He highlighted the high levels of interest and participation in the ninth IGF.

Two important announcements were made: The representative of the United States of Mexico extended an invitation to all participants to attend the eleventh IGF Meeting in the United States of Mexico in 2016, subject to the extension of the IGF mandate. In true multistakeholder fashion, the Brazilian representative invited the Executive Secretary of the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, Mr. Hartmut Glaser to the stage to invite participants to the tenth IGF, 10-14 November 2015, in Joao Pessoa, Brazil.

### 3.3 Announcements, Launches and Other Highlights of IGF 2014

#### Best Practice Forums (BPFs)

Best practice forums were held on the following topics:

- Developing Meaningful Multistakeholder Mechanisms
- Regulation and Mitigation of Unwanted Communications (Spam)
- Establishing and Supporting CERTS for Internet Security
- Creating an Enabling Environment for the Development of Local Content
- Online Child Safety and Protection

#### *Lessons learned and way forward:*

Participants discussed during the wrap-up session some of the problems with using the term “best practices” and came to an agreement that the IGF process moving forward could use instead “best practices to date” or “lessons learned to date”. This will reflect that the IGF needs to be very forward-looking and very flexible in the development of any recommendation for best practices, because those will continue to evolve with the Internet. There was also agreement that to make the exercise more effective, there is a need for both more time and more resources to support the efforts. The process definitely needs to be an iterative collaborative process, working for consensus, not negotiating final outcome text. Finally there was also agreement that in the future there needs to be more effort to understand the situation in developing countries, what kind of practices would be useful to people from those countries, and also to bring in youth.

The five executive summaries of the BPFs distributed on the last day of the meeting are attached to this Chair’s Summary in Annex 5.2.

#### Human Rights Roundtable

##### *Context:*

Human rights have been an increasingly prominent topic of discussion at the IGF over the past few years. The IGF’s first human rights roundtable was held during the 2012 IGF in Baku, hosted by Kenya, in partnership with APC, Finland and Sweden. This second human rights roundtable brought together a selection of the organisers of the 47 workshops at IGF 2014 that focused - directly or indirectly - on human rights issues.

##### *Summary and way forward:*

Participants met for a roundtable and endorsed a message document to be brought to the Human Rights Council panel on Privacy in the Digital Age on 12 September 2014. A copy of the message document is attached as Annex 5.3 of this Chair’s Summary. Participants recommend that the session on human rights at the IGF be institutionalised. Roundtable participants recognised a momentum in the discussion regarding the right to privacy and surveillance, and encourage this to be continued at the community level.

It was suggested that the IGF send regular messages to other bodies that relate to human rights on the Internet, so the IGF strengthens its interaction, not just with the Human Rights Council, but also with other UN bodies and the regional institutions.

Roundtable participants recognised the maturity on discussions of human rights at the IGF. In particular, the work of the Internet Rights and Principles Dynamic Coalition, and the increasing number of workshops on the topic at the IGF were mentioned. It was also underlined that maturity of the discussions at the IGF contributed to make human rights a central principle of the NETmundial Multistakeholder Statement of Sao Paulo. Participants also recommended the creation of a new best practice forum at the IGF on the issue of protection of privacy in the digital age. It was proposed that prior to the IGF 2015 in Brazil, a process could arrive at some definitional clarity as well as capture good practices on the protection of privacy in the digital age. This inter-sessional process needs to include developing country participation and make use of regional and national IGFs to ensure that such inclusion happens.

## **National and Regional IGF Roundtable**

### *Context:*

The 2014 national/regional IGF initiatives session was a focused interactive session that engaged coordinators and participants from the national and regional IGF initiatives and others interested or engaged in the initiatives.

The initial emergence of such initiatives really began after the launch of the first IGF and such initiatives were largely used at the national level to bring participation into the IGF itself.

Some of the initiatives will take place following the ninth IGF. The IGF national and regional initiatives are spread throughout the year.

### *Summary and way forward:*

It was clear during the session that there is great diversity between the way that the national and regional IGFs conduct their respective engagements. One size does not fit all. The need to work together was acknowledged.

There were also a number of references to what inter-sessional work can be done using the national and regional initiatives. It is clear that there should be increased cross-fertilisation between the growing network of national and regional IGFs and the global IGF.

A number of potential mechanisms to increase linkages between national and regional IGFs and the global IGF were discussed, including, but not limited to the following:

- Encourage and sponsor MAG member participation at the regional and national IGFs and MAG member liaison with their regional and national communities.
- Encourage national and regional IGF representation at IGF Open Consultations and MAG meetings.
- Develop and collaborate on papers from different national and regional participants.
- Bring best practices forums on issues critical to national and regional IGF.
- Facilitate capacity building from the global IGF on national and regional IGF initiatives.
- Sponsor the participation of experienced speakers from regional IGFs into national IGFs.
- Create a shared central repository of experienced speakers on critical IG issues.



Potential projects that could be developed during the inter-sessional time include:

- Create a working group on the impact of the last 10 years of IGF meetings for national/regional IGFs.
- Develop a standard to document summaries of each one of the national/regional initiatives' meetings and include them in a central repository.

### **High Level Leaders Meeting**

The host country convened a high level meeting on the topic of 'Capacity Building for Economic Development'. Thirty three high level leaders, including a deputy prime minister, ministers and deputy ministers, representatives of international organisations, presidents of regulatory bodies, leaders of entities from civil society, the private sector and the technical community spoke on this important topic.

### **NETmundial: Looking Back, Learning Lessons and Mapping the Road Ahead**

During this day-long follow-up event to the NETmundial in Sao Paulo, an interactive session strived to create a roadmap for institutional improvements to the global Internet governance ecosystem. This event also launched a book, titled [Beyond NETmundial: The Roadmap for Institutional Improvements to the Global Internet Governance Ecosystem](#).

### **Internet Governance Forum Support Association**

The Internet Society formally launched the Internet Governance Forum Support Association (IGFSA). The main objective of the association is to achieve a stable and sustainable funding mechanism to contribute to the United Nations IGF Trust Fund and support related activities. More information is available at <http://www.igfsa.org>.

### **Feminist Principles of the Internet**

The Association for Progressive Communications (APC) launched the document, "Feminist Principles of the Internet", at the Sex, Rights and Internet Governance pre-event. The document lists 15 principles that assert feminist views on positions related to Internet and communication rights, including privacy and surveillance, diverse and inclusive participation in decision-making, open source technology, regulation of sexual content and online pornography. The drafting of the principles began at a global meeting in April 2014 and were continued online via Twitter, using the hashtag #ImagineaFeministInternet, in the lead up to IGF 2014. Feedback and comments from stakeholders from the document is encouraged by the developers of the document at <http://www.genderit.org/articles/feminist-principles-internet>.

### **Enhancing ICANN Accountability and Governance Town Hall Meeting**

This meeting provided an opportunity for an open dialogue to address and clarify any concerns regarding to enhancing ICANN's accountability and governance process.

## **WSIS+10 High-Level Event Information Session**

This session on the World Summit on the Information Society High-level Event, organized by the ITU, provided an opportunity for the IGF community to learn more about the outcomes of the event and its implications for the ongoing UN General Assembly WSIS+10 review process.

## **CSTD Ten-year Review of WSIS**

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), which performs the CSTD secretariat function, is currently facilitating the CSTD's ten-year review of the progress made in the implementation of the WSIS outcomes, as mandated by the Economic and Social Council. UNCTAD encouraged IGF participants to contribute to through an online questionnaire at <http://unctad.org/en/Pages/CSTD/WSIS-10yearReview.aspx> by the deadline, 15 September 2014.

## **UNESCO's Comprehensive Study on the Internet**

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization asked stakeholders in Istanbul to contribute to its Internet study which covers issues related to access to information and knowledge, freedom of expression, privacy, and ethical dimensions of the information society. UNESCO encouraged all IGF participants to contribute to the study, which is open for comments until **30 November 2014**. The study is available at <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/crosscutting-priorities/unesco-internet-study>.

## **African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedoms**

The declaration, which is a Pan-African initiative to promote human rights standards and openness principles in Internet-policy making on the continent, was launched at the 2014 IGF. The declaration is available at <http://africaninternetrights.org>.

## **Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability (DCAD) Accessibility Guidelines**

The Internet Governance Forum's Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability (DCAD) approved and formally submitted a set of guidelines, "DCAD Accessibility Guidelines 2014: Accessibility and Disability in IGF meetings". The guidelines outline how to improve accessibility at IGF meetings and to eliminate barriers for participants with disabilities. The intention is to help the IGF Secretariat to improve accessibility for persons with disabilities and to encourage and facilitate their participation in IGF meetings. The document was formally presented during the Taking Stock main/focus session as an output document of the ninth IGF meeting. The guidelines are available at <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/dynamic-coalitions/dynamic-coalition-on-accessibility-and-disability/258-igf-2014-dcad-accessibility-guidelines-final-v5/file>

## **ITU and UNICEF Guidelines for Industry on Child Online Protection**

The International Telecommunications Union and the United Nations Children's Fund released the updated version of the Guidelines for Industry on Child Online Protection. The Guidelines provide advice on how the ICT industry can work to help ensure children's safety when using the Internet or any of the associated technologies or devices that can connect to it. The guidelines are available at <http://www.itu.int/en/cop/Pages/guidelines.aspx>.

## 4. The Road to IGF 2015

Based upon the wide ranging and forward looking discussions that took place throughout the week, the Chair invites the IGF MAG, in consultation with the entire community, to consider and discuss some issues at their earliest convenience that could be taken forward through inter-sessional work leading up to IGF 2015 in Brazil. The Chair believes that participants had many ideas for such work, as demonstrated in the “dialogue to action” and “possible ways forward” parts of this summary. The Chair asks the community to consider concentrating inter-sessional activities around themes of a developmental nature.

Using best practice forums or other modalities, such inter-sessional work could be brought forward through the national and regional IGF initiatives, the dynamic coalitions and other ad-hoc working groups within the IGF structure.

## 5. Annexes

### 5.1 List of Workshops, Dynamic Coalitions, Open Forums and Other Sessions

#### Workshops

Workshops are designed to explore detailed issues related to the main themes from different perspectives. As in previous years, a precondition for workshops to be included in the programme was a balance of stakeholders and viewpoints. Details of all workshops, including links to background papers and reports, are available from:

[http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/wks2014/index.php/proposal/list\\_public\\_accepted](http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/wks2014/index.php/proposal/list_public_accepted)

#### Content Creation, Dissemination and Use

- WS11: Languages on the move: Deploying multilingualism in the net
- WS18: The Business of Creativity: User Generated Content and IP
- WS66: Content4D: Diversifying the global content and apps market
- WS93: One World, Diverse Content and Flexible Access
- WS94: Creating, protecting and providing access to digital culture
- WS201: Building Local Content Creation Capacity: Lessons Learned

#### Critical Internet Resources

- WS23: Accountability in Multistakeholder Governance Regime ICANN
- WS44: Improving Internet Architecture to Drive Consumer Trust
- WS60: Global Access; Connecting the Next Billion Global Citizens
- WS100: Carrier Grade NAT Impacts on Users, Markets and Cybercrime
- WS114: Developing Countries Participation in Global IG
- WS185: ICANN Globalization and the Affirmation of Commitments

#### Emerging Issues

- WS61: Policies and practices to enable the Internet of Things
- WS63: Preserving a Universal Internet: The Costs of Fragmentation
- WS69: The Payment-Privacy-Policing Paradox in Web Payments Systems
- WS72: Building Technical Communities in Developing Regions
- WS112: Implications of post-Snowden Internet localization proposals
- WS142: Emerging Issues from the Arab Internet Community Perspective
- WS180: Crowd sourced Ideas for IG: NETmundial Brazilian experience

#### Enhancing Digital Trust

- WS1: Protecting Child Safety AND Child Rights
- WS2: Mobile, trust and privacy
- WS17: Privacy as Innovation II
- WS19: Empowering Global Youth Through Digital Citizenship
- WS43: Multi-Stakeholder Approaches to Cybersecurity Awareness
- WS47: Enhancing Digital Trust in the Post-Snowden Era
- WS71: Privacy, Surveillance, and the Cloud: One Year Later
- WS77: Cybercrime cooperation 4 developing countries: int'l frameworks
- WS97: Will Cyberspace fragment along national jurisdictions?
- WS104: Cybersecurity for ccTLDs – governance and best practices
- WS107: Internet blocking: When well intentioned measures go too far
- WS129: Internet tech and policy: privacy, data flows and trust

## **IGF and the Future of the Internet Ecosystem**

- WS31: Internet Governance: a case for variable geometry?
- WS49: The impact of (non-)adoption of Internet standards on cyber security
- WS80: ccTLDs: partners in developing local “IG literacy”
- WS95: Working together: initiatives to map & frame IG
- WS96: Accountability challenges facing Internet governance today
- WS118: Discussion on multistakeholderism in Africa
- WS124: Debates: Future IG Architecture
- WS134: AIGF Meeting: Future of Internet & Perspective for Africa
- WS139: Evaluating MS Mechanisms to Address Governance Issues
- WS140: The Future of the Global and Regional IGFs Post 2015
- WS152: Internet Governance: Challenges, Issues, and Roles
- WS153: Institutionalizing the “Clearing House” Function
- WS157: Crowdsourcing a Magna Carta for “The Web We Want”
- WS173: Youth involvement in Internet Governance
- WS191: ICANN Globalization in an Evolving IG Ecosystem
- WS196: IGF & Enhanced Cooperation, Parallel Tracks or Connected

## **Internet and Human Rights**

- WS20: Launch UNESCO publication Digital Safety of journalists
- WS21: Intermediaries’ role and good practice in protecting FOE
- WS56: Researching children's rights in a global, digital age
- WS82: Alternative routes protecting human rights on the Internet
- WS83: Human Rights for the Internet: From Principles to Action
- WS91: Launch of an African Declaration on Internet Rights & Freedoms
- WS126: Fostering Respect by Companies for Internet Users’ Rights
- WS132: Online Advocacy & Women Rights: Obstacles & successes
- WS146: Anonymity by Design: Protecting While Connecting
- WS149: Aligning ICANN Policy with Privacy Rights of Internet Users
- WS154: Intelligent Risk management in a mobile online environment
- WS158: Promoting Platform Responsibility For Content Management
- WS188: Transparency Reporting as a Tool for Internet Governance
- WS193: The Press Freedom Dimensions of Internet Governance
- WS220: Transnational Surveillance & Cross border Privacy Protections
- WS225: Online Freedoms and Access to Information Online

## **Internet as an Engine for Growth and Development**

- WS3: Cloud Computing & M2M: Impacts for Emerging Economies
- WS7: From ideas to solutions: Funding challenges for Internet dev
- WS10: New Global Visions for Internet Governance, ICTs and Trade
- WS15: Empowerment displaced people through online education svc.
- WS22: Clouds and mobile Internet: benefiting developing countries
- WS30: Internet and jobs: creative destruction or destructive creation?
- WS65: The Role of IXPs in Growing the Local Digital Economy
- WS68: Small Island Developing States (SIDS) Roundtable: The Information Society vs Basic Infrastructural Needs
- WS89: Multi-Stakeholder Engagement: Imperative for Accessibility
- WS136: Internet as an engine of growth and development

- WS159: Global Public Interest of the Internet
- WS171: Connecting Small Island States With Access To Data
- WS194: New Economics for the New Networked World
- WS198: Social and economic justice issues in global IG
- WS206: An evidence based intermediary liability policy framework

### **Policies Enabling Access**

- WS41: Policy to Promote Broadband Access in Developing Countries
- WS51: Connecting the continents through fiber optic
- WS70: Open Data and Data Publishing Governance in Big Data Age
- WS74: Enabling Affordable Access: Changing Role of the Regulator
- WS99: Digital inclusion policies for the forgotten billion
- WS163: Building alliances to enhance Internet affordability
- WS169: Technologies & Policies to Connect the Next Five Billion
- WS172: Network Neutrality: a Roadmap for Infrastructure Enhancement
- WS195: The Internet age: Adapting to a new copyright agenda
- WS208: Net Neutrality, Zero-Rating & Development: What's the Data?

### **Other**

- WS62: Internet Infrastructure: Technology and Terminology

## **Dynamic Coalitions**

The concept of dynamic coalitions and a number of coalitions were established as a result of the first IGF in Athens in 2006. These coalitions are informal, issue-specific groups comprising members of various stakeholder groups. Most dynamic coalitions allow collaboration of anyone interested in contributing to their discussions. Detailed information about dynamic coalition meetings held at IGF 2014 is available from:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2014/dynamic-coalition-meetings>

- Dynamic Coalition on Gender and Internet Governance
- Dynamic Coalition on Public Access in Libraries
- Dynamic Coalition on Network Neutrality
- Dynamic Coalition on Child Online Safety: “Disrupting and Reducing the Availability of Child Sex Abuse Materials on the Internet - How Can Technology Help?”
- Dynamic Coalition on Internet and Climate Change
- Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability
- Dynamic Coalition on the Internet of Things
- Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility
- Dynamic Coalition Internet Rights and Principles Dynamic Coalition: “The IRPC Charter of Human Rights and Principles for the Internet: Five Years On Youth Coalition on Internet Governance “
- Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values
- Dynamic Coalition on Freedom of Expression and Freedom of the Media on the Internet: “Battle for Free User Generated Content”

## Open Forums

Open forums can be held by all relevant organisations dealing with Internet governance related issues. Open forums focus on the organisation's activities during the past year and should allow sufficient time for questions and discussions. Governments can also hold an open forum to present their Internet governance related activities. Details information about open forums held at IGF 2014 is available from:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2014/open-forum-requests>

- ICANN Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) Open Forum
- Internet Society Open Forum: "ISOC @IGF: Dedicated to an Open Accessible Internet"
- Council of Europe Open Forum: "Your Internet, Our Aim: Guide Internet Users to Their Human Rights!"
- The Freedom Online Coalition Open Forum: "Protecting Human Rights Online"
- UNCTAD Open Forum: "Consultation on CSTD ten-year review of WSIS"
- UNESCO Open Forum: "Multistakeholder Consultation on UNESCO's Comprehensive Study on the Internet"
- ICANN Open Forum
- Ministry of Science, ICT and Future Planning (MSIP)/Korea Internet & Security Agency (KISA) Open Forum: "Korea's Effort to Advance Internet Environment including IPv6 Deployment"
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Open Forum: "The Economics of an Open Internet"
- ITU-UNICEF Open Forum: "Launch of Revised Guidelines for Industry on Child Online Protection, by ITU and UNICEF"
- World Wide Web Foundation Open Forum: "Measuring What and How: Capturing the Effects of the Internet We Want"

## Host Country Sessions

- Child Online Protection : Roles and Responsibilities, Best Practices and Challenges
- Perspectives on Internet Governance Research and Scholarship
- Policies for Enabling Broadband: Special Focus on OTTs and Level Playing Fields
- National & International Information Sharing Model in Cybersecurity & CERTs

## Side Meetings

Detailed information about side meetings can be found at:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2014/side-meetings>

- Enhancing ICANN Accountability and Governance Town Hall Meeting
- WSIS+10 High-Level Event – Information Session
- Seed Alliance Awards Ceremony
- Geneva Internet Conference: "Promising 2014 - a head start to the decisive 2015"
- Geneva Internet Platform: Where Internet meets diplomacy



- Council of Europe: “A Human Rights Perspective on ICANN’s Policies and Procedures”
- 10 Years of Internet Governance Book - 10 Thousands Copies - 10 Languages
- Privacy and the Right to be Forgotten
- Internet and Climate Change
- Launch of the GISWatch Report 2014
- APrIGF Multistakeholder Steering Group Open Meeting
- Friends of the IGF (FoIGF)

## Flash Sessions

Information about flash sessions can be found at:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2014/flash-sessions>

- Internet and Jurisdiction Project
- Crowd Sourced Solutions to Bridge the Gender Digital Divide

## Pre-Events

Information about pre-events can be found at:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2014/pre-events>

- Pre-Conference Seminar for CLDP Supported Delegations
- Collaborative Leadership Exchange on Multistakeholder Participation
- Sex, Rights and Internet Governance
- Global Internet Governance Academic Network (GigaNet) - 9th Annual Symposium
- NETmundial: Looking Back, Learning Lessons and Mapping the Road Ahead (including a book launch - Beyond NETmundial: The Roadmap for Institutional Improvements to the Global Internet Governance Ecosystem)
- Integration of Diasporas and Displaced People Through ICT
- Consultation on CSTD Ten-year Review of WSIS: Latin American and the Caribbean perspective
- IGF Support Association
- Empowering Grassroots Level Organizations Through the .NGO Top Level Domain
- A Safe, Secure, Sustainable Internet and the Role of Stakeholders
- Supporting Innovation on Internet Development in the Global South through Evaluation, Research, Communication and Resource Mobilization
- Multilingualism Applied in Africa
- Governance in a Mobile Social Web – Finding the Markers

## 5.2 Best Practice Forums' Executive Summaries

The following executive summaries from the Best Current Practice drafts have been included:

- Regulation and Mitigation of Unwanted Communications (Spam)
- Establishing and Supporting CERTs for Internet Security
- Online Child Safety and Protection
- Creating an Enabling Environment for the Development of Local Content
- Developing Meaningful Multistakeholder Mechanisms

## Best Practice Forum: Regulation and Mitigation of Unwanted Communications

### *Executive Summary*

The IGF Best Practice Forums seek to draw together the knowledge, wisdom, and expertise of stakeholders to provide useful insights to the whole Internet community. This forum focuses on the challenging issue of regulation and mitigation of unwanted communications, e.g. “spam”. Early on in the online discussion preceding the IGF, participants identified that spam affects many different stakeholders in different ways. From being a mere nuisance, spam grew to cause substantial costs e.g. in the form of network congestion and counter measures, has led to substantial losses and harm and threatens a person or a company’s on- and offline security. This has led to a loss of trust in the use of the Internet and thus economic loss. At the same time different stakeholders that have a role to play in the mitigation of spam, do not necessarily meet and discuss how to mitigate spam together.

A repository of resources related to this topic (documentation, lead experts, initiatives, etc.) has been made available on the IGF website.<sup>1</sup>

This forum did not so much reach consensus on topics. What is important to take notice of is that the forum participants and other experts who were engaged in the initial work, contributed to the draft document. They made the effort to show the current status quo and have made a head start on how to discuss the topic of spam further. The sessions at the IGF gave new thoughts that need work on further in the process described below, including the title of this group. The contributions were extremely valuable to the continuing process of the spam group. In general the following topics need further discussion.

**Common understanding of the problem.** The more aligned stakeholders are with regard to the problems, their severity and the priority of their resolution, the more focused the dialogue is, and the more coherent various efforts aimed at mitigating unsolicited communications will be.

**Common understanding of solutions.** The challenge here is that there is a whole array of possible solutions (technical, policy, economic, social) and each of them solves only part, or one set of the problem at a particular point in time. It is important to understand that there is no “silver bullet”, but rather, evolving building blocks that can be used in constructing many solutions.

**Understanding of common and individual costs/benefits.** The technology, policy, economic and social building blocks vary in the costs and the benefits they bring individually and to the common good of the global Internet. Understanding these factors and how they are aligned with the needs of governments, Internet users, the business objectives of network operators and other stakeholders is crucial for sustained improvements in addressing unsolicited communications.

**Ability to assess risks.** An adequate selection of tools and approaches is dependent on the ability to properly assess risks, including risks to the whole Internet ecosystem. This requires agreement on metrics and factual data and trends associated with them. This data is also important for the measurement of the effect of such tools once they are deployed and to monitor the changing dynamics of the environment.

**Identifying good practices.** An overview of good or common practices within communities involved in combatting spam seems absent or at least are unfamiliar between communities. To identify and/or make an inventory of these practices and share them with other stakeholders who have a need for this, is useful in developing multistakeholder approaches. These future overviews or lists could also be of added value to those starting work to address spam in developing countries.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/170-igf-2014/best-practice-forums-2014/1892-regulation-and-mitigation-of-unwanted-communications>

**The difference between the developing and developed world.** It is important to understand that there is a difference in the challenges they face. The developing world still has to find its way in mitigating spam at its most basic level. The developed world faces the challenge of dealing with professional, mostly malicious spammers that are active from or (ab) using resources in multiple jurisdictions.

#### *Next Steps*

This Best Practice Forum will take the following steps:

- The draft document on “spam” is available at <http://review.intgovforum.org/igf2014/>.
- Lead expert Karen Mulberry (Policy Advisor at ISOC) will continue to manage the existing mailing list and encourage additional comments and discussion. We encourage stakeholders interested in participating at this level to join the conversation.
- The IGF Secretariat (Wout de Natris) will continue to monitor the mailing list. Following closure of the draft comment period, he will revise the draft and make it available to the mailing list for additional comments. This document will be made publicly available in October.
- The consensus of stakeholders is that this best practices thread should be extended to address the open issues that have been recognized and the forum will reconvene at the 2015 IGF in Brazil. In the interim, the mailing list will continue to actively work on the draft document and successive drafts will be made publicly available for comment.

## **Best Practice Forum: Establishing and Supporting Computer Emergency Response Teams (CERTs) for Internet security**

### *Executive Summary*

The IGF Best Practice Forums seek to draw together the knowledge, wisdom, and expertise of stakeholders to provide useful insights to the whole Internet community. This forum focuses on the challenging issue of establishing and supporting Computer Emergency Response Teams (CERTs) for Internet security. A repository of resources related to this topic (documentation, lead experts, initiatives, etc.) has been made available on the IGF website.<sup>2</sup>

Early on in the process it became clear that the people contributing are used to working and cooperating together. Consensus was reached on several topics with ease. At the same time it was identified that reach out to other communities is necessary to have them understand the functionality and daily work at Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRTs) better. This starts with the use of the name: CSIRT. This follows from the low participation from other stakeholder groups. The main advice for the IGF stakeholders, at all levels, is: work on participation in this debate.

The draft document outlines the main topics that were identified by the group and explains many terms and existing good practices. For this we refer to the document. The following topics need more attention.

### **CSIRT over CERT**

To explain, this is the consensus text on what a CSIRT is:

“A Computer Security Incident Response Team (CSIRT) is a service organisation that is responsible for receiving, reviewing, and responding to computer security incident reports and activity. Their services are usually performed for a defined constituency that could be a parent entity such as a corporate, governmental, or educational organisation; a region or country; a research network; or a paid client”.

An incident was also agreed upon:

“An Incident is any real or suspected adverse event in relation to the security of computer systems or computer networks.” (The source is: CERT/CC CSIRT FAQ.)

This distinction is important, because the group advocates that the term CSIRT needs to be used over CERT. CSIRT, incident response, is thought by the group to reflect the work at hand best.

### **National CSIRT or CSIRT of last resort**

Further discussion is warranted on the national CSIRT definition, and the definition of a “CSIRT of last resort”. There is a need for “CSIRT of last resort” for a country, a team which can take at least some level of ownership of an incident if no other parties exist. This might be, but not necessarily is, a national CSIRT. It is important, especially for governments, to understand there are many different sorts of national CSIRTs, there is no role model, nor a need for one.

### **The role of CSIRTs**

Is there a role for CSIRT teams in addressing the root causes of incidents, such as prevention of cybercrime? This is an area ripe for multistakeholder discussion, e.g. with law enforcement.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/170-igf-2014/best-practice-forums-2014/1893-establishing-and-supporting-computer-emergency-response-teams-certs-for-internet-security>

## **The cost of participation in the CSIRT communities**

Cost of participation of developing countries in the CSIRT community and its international processes is interesting for future debate. What priorities can be set, and how can this type of work be funded?

## **Multistakeholder views**

There is a clear need to open the document up to other communities to find better ways of collaboration between different stakeholder groups.

It is extremely important for all stakeholders to understand that the work of CSIRTs is delicate. Cooperation is rooted in trust. Legislation does not provide trust, it is built up over time, by delivering what is needed. There is no other way than to gain trust through actions.

## *Next Steps*

This Best Practice Forum will take the following steps:

- The draft document on CSRTs is available at <http://review.intgovforum.org/igf2014/>
- Lead experts Maarten van Hoorenbeeck (Chair of FIRST), Adli Wahid (member of the FIRST SC) , and Christine Hoepers (General Manager of the Brazilian CERT) will continue to manage the existing mailing list and encourage additional comments and discussion. We encourage stakeholders interested in participating at this level to join the conversation.
- The IGF Secretariat (Wout de Natris) will continue to monitor the mailing list. Following closure of the draft comment period, he will revise the draft and make it available to the mailing list for additional comments. This document will be made publicly available in October.
- The consensus of stakeholders is that this best practices thread should be extended and the forum will reconvene at the 2015 IGF in Brazil. In the interim, the mailing list will continue to actively work on the draft document and successive drafts will be made publicly available for comment.

## Best Practice Forum: Online Child Protection

### *Executive Summary*

The IGF Best Practice Forums seek to draw together the knowledge, wisdom, and expertise of stakeholders to provide useful insights to the whole Internet community. This forum focuses on the challenging issue of online child protection.<sup>3</sup> Stakeholders contributed many useful ideas in a series of related areas:

- **Deep Resilience**

There are a wide variety of measures and programs that build and enhance child online protection including such things as media literacy, peer and parental mentoring, blocking technologies, and legal initiatives. These measures should be selected and implemented in concert in a culturally appropriate and respectful manner. This strategy also requires a high level of coordination between partners at all levels necessitating the development of strong communication channels and trust among them. Key intervention points include:

- Schools and other formal education programs
- Friends, family and peers
- Technology design through technology providers
- Points of internet access
- Law and regulation of content

- **Global Challenge, Local Measures**

Every child grows up in a unique environment. While the need to build resilience for children online is present globally, the deep resilience required depends on varying and adapting to meet local conditions. Economic, cultural, religious, and societal factors combine to create unique challenges.

- **Illegal vs. Inappropriate**

Objectionable content can be differentiated as illegal or inappropriate. Illegal content is defined by law and is a law enforcement and regulatory matter. Objectionable content is defined by local society and by caregivers. These two concepts are frequently conflated in discussions of child online protection and need to be made distinct.

- **Research**

While there is considerable and deep research to guide public policy makers in the global North, there is a lack of research addressing the child online protection needs of the global South. The Forum acknowledges this need and calls for new research in this area to help guide policy makers' decisions.

### *Next Steps*

This Best Practice Forum will take the following steps:

- The draft document on multistakeholder mechanisms is available at <http://review.intgovforum.org/igf2014/>
- Lead experts Jacqueline Beauchere (Chief Online Safety Officer, Microsoft), Carla Licciardello (Child online protection focal point, ITU) and Hannah Broadbent (Director of Policy and Strategy, Childnet) will continue to manage the existing mailing

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/170-igf-2014/best-practice-forums-2014/1895-best-practices-for-online-child-protection>

list and encourage additional comments and discussion. We encourage stakeholders interested in participating at this level to join the conversation.

- The IGF Secretariat (John Laprise) will continue to monitor the mailing list. Following closure of the draft comment period; he will revise the draft and make it available to the mailing list for additional comments. This document will be made publicly available in October.
- The consensus of stakeholders is that this best practices thread should integrate related work by the ITU, the European Commission and similar organisations. This consolidated effort could then be extended and the forum can reconvene at the 2015 IGF in Brazil. In the interim, the mailing list will continue to actively work on the draft document and successive drafts will be made publicly available for comment.



# Best Practice Forum: Creating an Enabling Environment for the Development of Local Content

## *Executive Summary*

The IGF Best Practice Forums seek to draw together the knowledge, wisdom, and expertise of stakeholders to provide useful insights to the whole Internet community. This forum focuses on the challenging issue of creating an enabling environment for the development of local content. A repository of resources related to this topic (documentation, lead experts, initiatives, etc.) has been made available on the IGF website.<sup>4</sup>

Early on in the online discussion, participants sought to define what “local content” means, and framed the issue as having three key areas of concern: infrastructure, law, and users. The lead experts took these themes into the forum with stakeholders contributing many useful ideas:

- **Infrastructure**

Participants voiced concerns about the challenge of local Internet infrastructure specifically mentioning resiliency, up time related to power interruptions, and capacity. Users value reliable access to content and in many cases rely on out of country hosting and accept latency due to tromboning of traffic in exchange for less-expensive hosting options abroad. They also noted the economic challenge facing local IXPs, which must make the up-front investment required for infrastructure improvement while remaining uncertain about the demand for the newly created capacity. Commercial stakeholders noted that they are frequently asked by countries to establish local caching facilities. These sometimes act as useful infrastructural hubs. However, it is not economically feasible for companies to establish such facilities everywhere.

- **Law**

Participants noted that some governments actively encourage local content by setting local requirements for hosting. Governments have also been anchor tenants for new IXPs to facilitate local infrastructure and enhance local e-government capacity.

- **Users**

Participants were most vocal about the local content challenge for users. They acknowledged that the majority of content was non-commercial. They also pointed out the challenge of multilingual content and its associated metadata. Participants suggested that advancing a metadata standard might be a useful way to enable users to create and control the content they produce and put online.

Participants also noted the particular role that culture plays in content and that many nations have multiple languages. The language groups may simultaneously identify cultural groups, which may stretch across national borders making legal remedies to support these language groups challenging. Even within a single state, a different language groups may represent groups of people with different levels of political power and influence. Enabling users by providing technology and access and relying upon user creativity may be the best way to enable all users to become creators.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/170-igf-2014/best-practice-forums-2014/1894-creating-an-enabling-environment-for-the-development-of-local-content>

## *Next Steps*

This Best Practice Forum will take the following steps:

- The draft document on multistakeholder mechanisms is available at <http://review.intgovforum.org/igf2014/>.
- Lead expert Susan Chalmers (Internet Policy Consultant) will continue to manage the existing mailing list for the time being and encourage additional comments and discussion. We encourage stakeholders interested in participating at this level to join the conversation.
- The IGF Secretariat (John Laprise) will continue to monitor the mailing list. Following closure of the draft comment period, he will revise the draft and make it available to the mailing list for additional comments. This document will be made publicly available in October.
- The consensus of stakeholders is that this best practices thread should be extended and the forum will reconvene at the 2015 IGF in Brazil. In the interim, the mailing list will continue to actively work on the draft document and successive drafts will be made publicly available for comment.

# Best Practice Forum: Developing Meaningful Multistakeholder Participation Mechanisms

## *Executive Summary*

The IGF Best Practice Forums seek to draw together the knowledge, wisdom, and expertise of stakeholders to provide useful insights to the whole Internet community. This forum focuses on the challenging issue of developing meaningful multistakeholder participation mechanisms. A repository of resources related to this topic (documentation, lead experts, initiatives, etc.) has been made available on the IGF website<sup>5</sup>. Stakeholders have contributed many useful ideas in a series of related areas:

- **Definitions**

Meaningful discussions of practices begin with defining terms. Many parties define multistakeholderism in many ways notably and recently at NetMundial. Participants also brought their own definitions for discussion. The definition which will be used in the next draft will reflect a synthesis of these ideas.

Another key issue raised by participants was that of language. “Multistakeholderism” is opaque jargon to many. A call for using less jargon will be heeded and will be applied in the next draft. A second language issue is the ongoing challenge of accommodating the nuances and meanings, both explicit and implicit into a document that is supposed to speak to a global multilingual community. The reduction of jargon will reduce the scale of this problem too.

- **Stakeholders**

Stakeholders are the active drivers of multistakeholderism. Their concerns inherently shape the nature and character of their participation. Participants noted that unequal power relationships are one of the most difficult challenges facing stakeholders. They pointed out that stakeholders at a multistakeholder meeting may have nominal equality but this equality erodes upon leaving the table. The potential threat of coercive power between unequal stakeholders endangers full and open participation and ways to acknowledge this issue should be addressed.

Participants also recognised the challenge of legitimacy as affected stakeholders may not be represented in multistakeholder mechanisms for a wide variety of reasons. Their involvement will lead to more successful outcomes and bridging that gap is an ongoing challenge. A related challenge is the coordination of stakeholders who share common viewpoints. Enabling them to discover each other enhances their mutual ability to participate constructively.

Finally, participants noted the danger and challenge of stakeholders who participate with the intent to thwart a multistakeholder process. Identifying good faith actors and enabling them to participate constructively is as crucial to the success of a process as is identifying and addressing bad-faith actors.

- **Trust**

Trust among stakeholders and in the process is crucial to successful multistakeholder mechanisms. Participants identified many factors contributing to the development of trust among stakeholders including: sharing common goals; following through on process and meeting expectations; insuring the consistency of the process; supporting the legitimacy of the mechanism through transparency and accountability; and regularizing processes and making them predictable and reliable.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/170-igf-2014/best-practice-forums-2014/1891-developing-meaningful-multistakeholder-participation-mechanisms>

- **Accountability and transparency**

Participants confirmed that accountability and transparency are important to successful multistakeholder mechanisms. They also pointed out that a multistakeholder mechanism is not just accountable to its stakeholders but also stakeholders are accountable to the mechanism.

This duality of responsibility is an important and frequently overlooked aspect of accountability.

### *Next Steps*

This Best Practice Forum will take the following steps:

- The draft document on multistakeholder mechanisms is available at <http://review.intgovforum.org/igf2014/>.
- Lead experts Avri Doria (Technicalities, dotgay LLC, APC), Bill Graham (Senior Fellow, CIGI) and George Sadowsky (Board Director, ICANN) will continue manage the existing mailing list and encourage additional comments and discussion. We encourage stakeholders interested in participating at this level to join the conversation.
- The IGF Secretariat (John Laprise) will continue to monitor the mailing list. Following closure of the draft comment period, a revised draft will be made available to the mailing list for additional comments. This document will be made publicly available in October.
- The consensus of stakeholders is that this best practices thread should be extended and the forum will reconvene at the 2015 IGF in Brazil. In the interim, the mailing list will continue to actively work on the draft document and successive drafts will be made publicly available for comment.

### 5.3 Recommendation to the UN General Assembly for an Open Ended Mandate of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

The Internet is here to stay. The Internet Governance Forum 2014, with over 3300 people gathered in Istanbul and many more participating remotely, demonstrated the eagerness there is to connect across continents and discuss the Internet's many governance challenges and opportunities for economic growth and societal benefits. In response to broad multi-stakeholder support for continuing and strengthening the IGF, many participants have agreed on the need for a more stable mandate. We believe an open-ended mandate would facilitate the strengthening of IGF procedures, enable participants to secure long-term funding for projects, and support the IGF Trust Fund.

In 2005, the World Summit for the Information Society asked the UN Secretary-General in the Tunis Agenda, to convene a meeting for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue—called the Internet Governance Forum (IGF).

The mandate of the Forum was to discuss public policy issues relating to key elements of Internet governance, such as those enumerated in the Tunis Agenda, in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet for all. The Forum was not to replace existing arrangements, mechanisms, institutions or organizations. It was intended to constitute a neutral, non-duplicative and non-binding process, and have no involvement in day-to-day or technical operations of the Internet.

The Tunis Agenda also asked the UN Secretary-General “to examine the desirability of the continuation of the Forum, in formal consultation with Forum participants, within five years of its creation, and to make recommendations to the UN Membership in this regard”. At its sixty-fifth session, the General Assembly decided to extend the mandate of the IGF, underlining the need to improve the IGF “with a view to linking it to the broader dialogue on global Internet governance”[1].

In his note on the continuation of the Forum in 2010, the UN Secretary General confirmed that many participants considered it to be “unique and valuable” and should be preserved. It is a place where governments, civil society, the private sector, the UN and international organizations build a common understanding of the Internet’s great potential.

The Secretary-General recommended:

- (a) That the mandate of the Internet Governance Forum be extended for a further five years;
- (b) That the desirability of continuation be considered again by Member States within the context of a 10-year review of implementation of the outcome of the World Summit on the Information Society in 2015[2];

The Forum is indeed a valuable part of the international dialogue on Internet issues and is worth preserving. However, the revolving five-year mandate is a barrier to long range planning and investment. Many voices have called for the strengthening of the IGF, but a longer planning horizon is necessary to meet the needs of the multi-stakeholder community. While more work needs to be done, some initiatives to strengthen the IGF are already taking place:

- To address the need for sustainable funding, the Internet Governance Forum Support Association (<http://www.igfsa.org/>) was formed at IGF 2014. The goal of this non-profit is to promote sustainable funding for the IGF.
- A comprehensive report on the successes of this Forum will be published following the 2014 conference in Istanbul.

- More than 30 regional and national IGF initiatives have developed in all continents, enabling new forms of open and inclusive participation in Internet governance.
- Dynamic coalitions have emerged and produced substantive work on complex issues. These inter-sessional initiatives need to be taken to the next level of maturity.

Many of these collaborative community-designed initiatives are in danger of sunseting, because of uncertainty in funding. This is why we are asking that the mandate be extended immediately, so that we do not lose momentum.

In order to allow the IGF to reach its full potential as a forum for all stakeholders in Internet Governance, we, the undersigned participants in the 2014 IGF, recommend an open-ended extension of the IGF's mandate as soon as possible.

This letter will remain open for signature until November 1, 2014.

## 5.4 Message to the United Nations Human Rights Council from the Roundtable for Organisers of Workshops on Enhancing Digital Trust and the Internet and Human Rights

Participants at the United Nations Internet Governance Forum (IGF) 2014 met on Friday 5 September to reflect on IGF workshops related to the issues of enhancing digital trust and the Internet and human rights. We were aware of the United Nations Human Rights Council 27th Session and the panel which will consider the report of the High Commissioner for Human Rights on the Right to Privacy in the Digital Age.

At IGF 2014, approximately 47 out of 87 workshops focused directly or indirectly on human rights, with privacy, surveillance, freedom of expression, freedom of association, and economic, cultural and social rights emerging as main themes. In this context, IGF 2014 participants (including people from governments, civil society, the private sector, academic and technical communities) formulated an input to bring to the Human Rights Council on the right to privacy in the digital age.

We agreed on the following key messages:

- The right to privacy was a significant thematic issue at IGF 2014, including concerns about widespread privacy violations, the need for transparency, clear privacy standards and procedures for protection, and emerging issues such as mobile Internet access.
- We believe that for Internet to fulfil its potential, human rights need to be respected on the Internet. We note the contribution that the Internet Governance Forum has made to the discussion of human rights and the impact of the Human Rights Council resolution 20/8 2012, which affirmed the same human rights we have offline also apply online.
- We agree with the High Commissioner that the right to privacy is linked to other rights such as the right to freedom of expression, freedom of association, amongst others. We agree with the High Commissioner that: “Effectively addressing the challenges related to the right to privacy in the context of modern communications technology will require an ongoing, concerted multi-stakeholder engagement.”
- We not only agree, we also embody such multi-stakeholder engagement through our participation at the IGF, a United Nations mandated multi-stakeholder forum. We therefore agree that the Human Rights Council’s response to current challenges “should include a dialogue involving all interested stakeholders, including member states, civil society, scientific and technical communities, the business sector, academics and human rights experts.”
- We urge the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Human Rights Council members, member states, regional human rights bodies and national human rights institutions to engage with the Internet Governance Forum as a space for dialogue involving all stakeholders and as a means to assist and inform the Office of the High Commissioner.
- We urge the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Human Rights Council members, member states, regional human rights mechanisms and national human rights institutions to participate in IGF 2015, which will take place in Brazil.