The Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values

http://coreinternetvalues.org/

Report on the proceedings of the Coalition Meeting held during IGF Joao Pessoa, Brazil

The sixth IGF meeting of the Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values was held on 11th November 2015, Wednesday at Workshop Room 3 during the 10th Internet Governance Forum, Joao Pessoa, Brazil.

Estimated Number of Participants: 20 in the room, about 30 remote participants through various platforms.

Panelists:

Olivier Crepin Leblond, Past Chair of the ICANN At-Large Advisory Committee, as Chair.
Kathryn Brown, President and CEO of the Internet Society
Paul Wilson, Director General of APNIC
Erika Mann, Member, Board of Directors, ICANN (apologies)
Carlton Anthony Samuels, former Member of the At-Large Advisory Committee
Mark Carvell, Representative of the United Kingdom at Governmental Advisory Committee ICANN
Joly MacFie, Remote Coordination

About the Dynamic Coalition:

The dynamic coalition on Core Internet Values was formed following the "Workshop on Fundamentals: Core Internet Values" held during the 2009 IGF at Egypt, chaired by the Internet Society Past President Lynn St.Amour. The Coalition has met during the five IGFs that followed Egypt and its sixth meeting was at Brazil, chaired by Olivier Crepin Le-Blond.

The pursuit of the Coalition in general is to work towards causing the Internet to evolve in such a manner that its Core Values are not compromised. The stakeholders to Internet Governance might share the view that the Internet remains Global as One Internet, Open, Free, end to end so as to foster Global Access, Permission-less Innovation and Global Prosperity.

The sub-theme of the 6th meeting in particular was : "Core Internet Values as a Reference Standard for Global Internet Policy".

This has been be to discuss the thought that the organizations responsible for components of Internet Governance including large Internet Organizations, Governments and Civil Society organizations could formulate/contribute to formulate Internet policy in a manner that the Internet does not slip away from Core Internet Values. The organizations responsible for components of Internet governance including large internet organizations, governments, and civil society organizations could formulate or

contribute to formulate Internet policy in a manner that the Internet does not slip away from core internet values.

Main Messages/ Deliberations from the meeting at Joao Pessoa, Brazil

- The Core Internet Values Coalition is engaged in a discussion on the set of values that are primarily technical in scope, but extend to the societal sphere as Social Values, though not extending the scope of discussions as far as freedom of speech or Human Rights.

- The technical values result in a larger sociological benefits. The architectural values of the Internet including openness and interoperability result in the Internet being a global network of networks [that connects people globally].

- On the notion of Core Internet Values, there are two points of view: One view is that there are values that the Internet ought to not slip away from, hence unlaterable. The other view is that some changes are inevitable on some of the values, for example, compromises to the end to end principle were made when NAT was widely adopted.

- Network Address Translation (NAT), for instance, or various types of network filtering in a way overwrite the end-to-end principle, but with the introduction of the new IPv6 protocols, this compromise would be unnecessary.

- The RIR policies have always had an absolute concern with the routability of addresses that are allocated. It would be possible to manage or mismanage addresses to the extent that a small number or a large number became unroutable in parts of the Internet or globally. Transition to IPv6 could ensure that every point on the Internet reachable.

- The global nature of the Internet is dependent upon and linked to policy choices.

- Internet is a network of networks that are interoperable and that there are agreements between these networks for the transit of bits that are distributed across the network and identified by unique identifiers in very, very different ways than traditional telecommunications networks that regulators grew up with; it is a very different architecture which requires a different kind of understanding of how one builds on it

- Some governments find adjusting to this New World of a single globally interoperable communication medium so difficult - they wish to exert some sort of sovereign control over Internet activity and the ability of their citizens to access the Internet

- Some other governments are known not be particularly conducive to defend those core principles. And then yet others have been very positively vocal about preserving Core Internet Values.

- Most governments would consider a wholly governmental approach to certain issues to be inappropriate, as it would lead to fundamental mistakes. It would be a slow process if Governments do not take account of the need to engage with the technical community and other constituencies in the Internet ecosystem

- UK Government had to reassess its approach to Internet Policy and its responses, given that the Internet is essentially borderless and the classic government approach to define within its country laws and rules that would apply, that approach will simply not work.

- Security is one of the major concerns of Governments. Internet Society has developed and recommends an approach called collaborative security (http://goo.gl/7wsB9b) to understand the problem areas, and identify the problems to be solved. And then to bring the legitimate stakeholders and experts to the table to solve it.

- Many governments are recognizing this, and they are instituting changes to the way in which they do develop their policy responses to threats. It involves a lot of coordination now across administrations that never used to happen.

- Business on the Internet is very different, because of the nature of the global reach and distributed nature of the Internet itself which enables the business to get anywhere, from anywhere, to many. Many businesses find it actually an exciting new way to think about business, but some have been very threatened by it.

- For example, the old style telecoms conglomerates viewed the Internet and voice over IP as the biggest threat to threat to their businesses. The revenues of telecommunication companies declined on account of voice services. At the same time, connectivity and bandwidth became new services. The revenue models have changed, and they [are still slow] to adapt to the opportunities for Telcos for innovation and for expansion of economic and social activity.

- They see threats to their livelihood and so they think they should intervene. Increasingly they are trying to get governments to use their role as policy maker. Governments are not to make that decision by themselves alone.

- The Coalition fully supports permissionless innovation, the user doesn't need to ask anyone for a license before creating an application on the Internet.

- The threats of fragmentation are still very much present. On a National level, fragmentation is about different Internet islands that are separated with "moats and drawbridges" (http://goo.gl/hQeDHG)

- The threat is also from artificial borders raised by walled gardens and the zero-rating services.

- Zero-rating service is an application of the Internet. It's clearly an Internet service, an application, could be a step that enables access and enables connectivity. The application is not the Internet.

- An alternate point of view is that any service that enables a user to get online then reduces the cost to get online is useful. One needs to be adamantly clear that such a service is not to be advertised as "the Internet", nor lock in a user so the user cannot go anywhere [else]. In other words, there must be a path to graduation from the service offered.

- Advertisements and even spam are content, any regulation would require that the content be inspected first. But, content regulation is a very slippery slope.

Questions and Answers

- The idea of a borderless nature of the Internet is something which has been quite difficult for some countries to grasp and for some stakeholders to grasp. Content providers and the Entertainment industry were used to a market over which were very much in control. *Are we looking at a radical change of the overall nature of business and nature of the way one has to look at the Internet issues and intellectual property in the way that countries regulate services?*

  > Business on the Internet is very different, because of the nature of the global reach and distributed nature of the Internet itself, which enables the business to get anywhere, from anywhere, to many. Many businesses find it actually an exciting new way to think about business, but some have been very threatened by it.

- *What are the dangers of not receiving multi stakeholder inputs for government‑led set of decisions?*

  > The risk is of adopting wholly contradictory approach to the Internet, one that impairs the development of it in a truly innovative, user‑centric way that reflects what citizens want from it and also what governments can actually get out of the Internet themselves

- *Would the Internet Society consider inspiring its organisational members to articulate and commit to core Internet values and inspire them to consider formulating their business policy in a manner that the core Internet values are respected?*

  > That is what Internet Society's conversation [has always been] about with its members, chapters and organizational members.

- *Are these values actually enforceable?*

The Core Internet Values as articulated are not "enforceable" We could stand for a set of values in principle that is meaningful and real. It is the permissionless, liberal and permissive approach that we want to take rather than one of requiring compliance and sanctions.

- *Would governments be interested or agree to be signatories for adhering to core values?*

   Such a process would be very difficult to manage. It would be a complex and lengthy process of negotiation [that would be immensely difficult]. It is useful to define and articulate core values which should inform government policy making. Those elements that are defined here are recognized by most governments as essential determinants for maximizing the social and economic benefits of Internet technologies and applications, using a wholly neutral Internet infrastructure. These values could be considered aspirational values.

- *As earlier users of the Internet and first participants of the Internet revolution, Europe and USA have a deeper understanding of the core Internet values and about the multistakeholder process. As governments who respect these Values, what work is being done by the UK and European governments and the United States multilaterally to disseminate the merits of the multistakeholder process of Internet Governance and Core Internet Values, on a ministerial or even at higher level?*

   In ICANN, we engage with the community alongside many other governments. We are all advocating how the multistakeholder model, as demonstrated by ICANN, can evolve and improve and build on success. We do this multilaterally with other governments at ministerial level and at official level, to discuss how we can advance the multistakeholder model, ensure that governments have the capacity to engage effectively. Also, there's a lot of dialogue going on, at official level, at international level. We have a European group on Internet Governance where the officials meet from all the Member States of the EU.

Observations/Comments of a recommendatory nature from the deliberations of the Dynamic Coalition on Core Internet Values meeting during IGF Joao Pessoa, Brazil:

The coalition could articulate the values, identifying values that are not yet enumerated.

Core Internet Values could be considered aspirational values and could inform government policy making. The values articulated (and to be articulated) could be [acknowledged] / recognized by governments as essential determinants for maximizing the social and economic benefits of a Global, neutral and Open Internet.

Governments need to develop their policy in with greater understanding and in [an informed way](https://www.cigionline.org/publications/nature-of-internet) (https://www.cigionline.org/publications/nature-of-internet) taking into account the technical evolution of the Internet, the dynamics of it and the Core Internet Values, <u>without</u> a top-down approach that simply does not recognize the dynamics of the Internet.

It is important to connect every user to all users; It is important to ensure the availability of all services are available across the Internet, allowing users to access all applications without discrimination against applications and services; It is necessary to ensure that all participants are treated fairly and with equity

Spectrum policies need to allow for access to the spectrum on an equitable basis and enable community networks to participate

Any form of content regulation requires a lot more introspection and a lot more collaboration.

It is to be emphasized that [Internet] governance should be multistakeholder, this means adapting to a whole new approach to policy development.

Governments need to fully embrace the multi stakeholder process for Internet Governance. It might require increased efforts in multilateral fora to promote a better understanding of the multistakeholder process

The major concern of Governments related to Security could be addressed by an approach called "[collaborative security](#)" as developed by the Internet Society. This approach would be to understand the problem areas, and identify the problems to be solved and then to bring the legitimate stakeholders and experts to the table to solve it.

The values already articulated and to be articulated could be embedded in the outcome documents of IGF and other events. It's always important to reassert these core values in that way.

Link to Transcript: http://goo.gl/vWJs7p
Link to Webcast: https://goo.gl/OBd4DA
Link to the Blog : http://coreinternetvalues.org/