

# **Internet Governance Forum: A development perspective**

**A primer for the third meeting,  
Hyderabad, India, 3–6 December, 2008**

Tony Vetter

August 2008

---

# Internet Governance Forum: A development perspective

## A primer for the third meeting, Hyderabad, India, 3–6 December, 2008

---

Tony Vetter

August 2008

---

© 2008 International Institute for Sustainable  
Development (IISD)

Published by the International Institute for  
Sustainable Development

The International Institute for Sustainable  
Development contributes to sustainable  
development by advancing policy recommendations  
on international trade and investment, economic  
policy, climate change, measurement and  
assessment, and natural resources management.  
Through the Internet, we report on international  
negotiations and share knowledge gained through  
collaborative projects with global partners, resulting  
in more rigorous research, capacity building in  
developing countries and better dialogue between  
North and South.

IISD's vision is better living for all—sustainably; its  
mission is to champion innovation, enabling  
societies to live sustainably. IISD is registered as a  
charitable organization in Canada and has 501(c)(3)  
status in the United States. IISD receives core  
operating support from the Government of Canada,  
provided through the Canadian International  
Development Agency (CIDA), the International  
Development Research Centre (IDRC) and  
Environment Canada; and from the Province of  
Manitoba. The institute receives project funding  
from numerous governments inside and outside  
Canada, United Nations agencies, foundations and  
the private sector.

International Institute for Sustainable Development  
161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
Canada R3B 0Y4  
Tel: +1 (204) 958–7700  
Fax: +1 (204) 958–7710  
E-mail: [info@iisd.ca](mailto:info@iisd.ca)  
Web site: <http://www.iisd.org/>

## Contents

Executive Summary .....	2
The Development Perspective.....	3
Background on Internet Governance .....	4
1. IGF Review and the Way Forward.....	4
2. Development Theme in the Agenda-setting Dialogue.....	6
3. Themes and Basic Structure for IGF Hyderabad .....	7
4. Development Focus of Remaining Workshop Proposals .....	13
5. Dynamic Coalitions.....	17

## Executive Summary

Taking on a development perspective, this primer summarizes the consultations among Internet Governance Forum (IGF) contributors in preparation for the December 2008 meeting in Hyderabad, India. This summary of the consultations is organized under the following themes:

- IGF Review and the Way Forward ;
- Development Theme in the Agenda-setting Dialogue;
- Themes and Basic Structure for IGF Hyderabad;
- Analysis of Workshop Proposals; and
- Updates on Dynamic Coalitions of Interest to the Development Community.

Efforts by civil society participants to maintain and advance consideration at the IGF for development objectives and outcomes—including those of sustainable development—continue to make measurable progress. This is happening despite the efforts of a comparatively small, but well-organized, vocal and persistent group of stakeholders whose aim is to advance a narrow view of Internet governance (IG). According to this view, global governance considerations are necessary only when related to critical Internet resources (domain name systems, root servers and Internet protocol addresses). A larger group of stakeholders, consisting of governments, private sector representatives, civil society and the “technical community,” take a broader view, considering issues of Internet access, openness, security, stability, diversity and others, to be inseparable from technical decisions. This view is consistent with the IGF’s mandate outlined in Paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda.<sup>1</sup>

However it is clear from the Hyderabad consultations that there is a general perception the breadth of Internet governance issues was adequately explored in the first two IGF meetings, and that “it is now time to focus in on the detail of selected issues, and make some demonstrable progress.”<sup>2</sup> The IGF Chair has acknowledged the concerns of competing viewpoints for choosing a focus for the upcoming Hyderabad meeting in his guidance to the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) that “we should limit what we are talking about to things which are within the limit of our constituencies. But nevertheless, we can't be too rigid about the subject matter and say that development is not in or out.”<sup>3</sup> Along with the IGF Secretariat’s acknowledgement of linkages with sustainable

---

<sup>1</sup> See “WSIS Tunis Agenda for the Information Society,” <http://www.itu.int/wsis/docs2/tunis/off/6rev1.html>.

<sup>2</sup> Nitin Desi, IGF Chair, Internet Governance Forum open consultations, Geneva, 26 February 2008, <http://www.intgovforum.org/feb26/Geneva-IGF-2-26-08%20Full%20Day%20ver1.txt>.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

development as an emerging issue at the close of IGF Rio,<sup>4</sup> there is clear support for ongoing and increased interest and participation from members of the development, and sustainable development communities in the IGF process.

## The Development Perspective

There is mounting anecdotal, econometric and theoretical support for the role of information and communication technology (ICT) in growth and development, particularly in developed economies. However 75 per cent of the world's poor live in rural areas where access to information and communication technology is limited. Furthermore, the utility of access even when available is often limited by issues such as the lack of local content, low literacy, restrictions on freedom of expression, challenges to access to information and knowledge, and spam to name a few. Such issues are of concern to the human development perspective<sup>5</sup> which sees disparity in ICT access and utility between developed and developing countries as a contributor to widening income divides.

The sustainable development perspective is inclusive of these concerns—that overriding priority should be given to meeting the essential needs of the world's poor—but mindful of the limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment's ability to meet present and future needs.<sup>6</sup> The diffusion of technologies supporting access to and expansion of the Internet is increasingly relevant to the latter in that consumption of these technologies has grown at exponential rates far exceeding efforts to ramp up their recycling and reuse. At the same time, the Internet is proving to be an indispensable tool for: supporting new environmental monitoring and analysis capabilities; raising awareness of unsustainable practices; and empowering organizations and individuals to self organize, as well as promote the behavioural change necessary for achieving sustainable development. Therefore “preserving the Internet's role in fostering innovation, economic growth, and democratic communication”<sup>7</sup> is equally important to the sustainable development perspective as well.

The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) believes that decision-makers engaging with Internet governance issues are therefore key actors in global sustainability through the role they play shaping the evolution and utility of the Internet. The specific efforts of IISD to link Internet governance to sustainable development at the IGF are discussed later in this primer.

---

<sup>4</sup> Chairman's summary of the Second Meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), Rio de Janeiro, 12–15 November 2007, [http://www.intgovforum.org/Rio\\_Meeting/Chairman%20Summary.FINAL.16.11.2007.pdf](http://www.intgovforum.org/Rio_Meeting/Chairman%20Summary.FINAL.16.11.2007.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Human development seeks to address social, economic, political, cultural and legal concerns.

<sup>6</sup> See “What is Sustainable Development?,” <http://www.iisd.org/sd/>.

<sup>7</sup> Civil Society – TUAC, “The Seoul Declaration” to the OECD Ministerial Conference on the Future of the Internet Economy, Seoul, Korea, 16 June 2008. Retrieved 3 July 2008 from <http://thepublicvoice.org/events/seoul08/seoul-declaration.pdf>.

## Background on Internet Governance

The Internet, considered by many to be the global infrastructure of the information society, is the most critical piece of the economic, social and cultural foundation of our time. Internet governance has been on the international agenda for a relatively short time. In a very narrow sense, it has been around since the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) was created in 1998 to manage the Internet's domain names and addresses under a Memorandum of Understanding with the U.S. Department of Commerce. In a wider sense, international dialogue has been ongoing since 2003, when delegates to the first phase of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) began airing concerns regarding the governance of the Internet. The second phase of WSIS in 2005 brought about an understanding that Internet governance is a much wider concept than the operations of ICANN. The Internet poses a variety of legal, policy and business challenges throughout the realms of international trade; the use of common resources; development of technology, networks and services; and efforts for global development.<sup>8</sup> The WSIS Working Group on Internet Governance developed this working definition of Internet governance, which was adopted by the WSIS governments in the Tunis Agenda:

...the development and application by governments, the private sector and civil society, in their respective roles, of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programmes that shape the evolution and use of the Internet.<sup>9</sup>

This final meeting of WSIS saw the creation of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), a “multistakeholder” space where diverse groups of stakeholders could engage in dialogue—but not policy-making—around the questions of Internet governance.

### 1. IGF Review and the Way Forward

Participants of open consultations recognized that the first two IGF meetings, held in Athens and Rio de Janeiro, served their purpose in establishing the Forum's credibility and role in the global system. There has also been general consensus that the IGF has since stagnated, and that participants have struggled with moving issues forward. Specifically, it is felt that the four general themes used in both of the previous meetings—access, security, diversity and openness—have

<sup>8</sup> MacLean, Don M. “Herding Schrödinger's Cats: Some Conceptual Tools for Thinking about Internet Governance: Background Paper for the ITU Workshop on Internet Governance.” Geneva, 26–27 February 2004, p. 13.

<sup>9</sup> See WSIS (World Summit on the Information Society) Executive Secretariat (Ed.). “Tunis Agenda for the Information Society.” Document WSIS-5/TUNIS/DOC/6(Rev.1)-E. Geneva, ITU, 2005, paragraph 34.

served their useful purpose in helping to bring to the surface, and create a space for debating, the broad range of public policy issues that are key elements of Internet governance. Many have expressed the opinion that the main sessions in Rio were too generic in focus and that the IGF should now focus on providing concrete directions, ideas and possibilities for global public policy, consistent with the Forum's mandate. Towards this end, many are calling for main sessions that specifically and explicitly address public policy issues of the highest priority.

The challenge now facing the IGF is to retain its “multilateral, multistakeholder, democratic and transparent” nature in a manner “that it is neutral, non-duplicative and nonbinding, consistent with the WSIS guidelines,”<sup>10</sup> while, at the same time, achieving practical outcomes. It has been suggested that one of the lessons from Rio was that “successful multistakeholder Internet governance discussions at the local level are essential to progressing Internet governance at the global level.”<sup>11</sup> Many suggestions on how the IGF could achieve more practical and useful outcomes draw on this lesson, in their call for the sharing of successful examples locally nationally, regionally and internationally, with consideration of the capacity building, and other needs of developing countries for Internet governance.<sup>12</sup>

The open consultations and Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) meetings being held in preparation for the next Internet Governance Forum (IGF) meeting in Hyderabad, India, 3–6 December 2008 mark the agenda-setting phase of preparations. Participants who hold a narrow view of Internet governance have made it clear that they think the IGF needs to concentrate its scarce time and attention on “critical Internet resources” policy issues<sup>13</sup>, and make some demonstrable progress in the this area. Participants who subscribe to a broader view of IG, in particular the embodying of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes, with consideration of development objectives and outcomes, have voiced the opinion that Internet governance will not be taken seriously by the broader international community unless its relevance to pressing global challenges is demonstrated before the end of its initial five-year mandate. This view presupposes the inseparability of technical and policy decisions. Balancing these two viewpoints has been shepherded by the Multistakeholder Advisory Group, and facilitated by the IGF Secretariat, based on inputs received during the open consultations.

---

<sup>10</sup> Bill Graham, on behalf of the Internet Society (ISOC), Internet Governance Forum OPEN consultations Geneva, 26 February 2008, <http://www.intgovforum.org/feb26/Geneva-IGF-2-26-08%20Full%20Day%20ver1.txt>.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Many draw the distinction here between capacity building for Internet governance versus ICTs for development.

<sup>13</sup> Specifically the operational issues, stability, and security of domain name systems, root servers, and Internet protocol addresses.

## 2. Development Theme in the Agenda-setting Dialogue

The relevance of Internet governance to development objectives and outcomes is a key point of tension between those subscribing to a narrow view of Internet governance and those with a broader view. Many feel that adopting a “development” mandate<sup>14</sup> makes the IGF prone to ICT for development (ICT4D) mission creep. The IGF has captured the attention of civil society as the engaged global policy discussion forum to have emerged from the WSIS process making it a natural focal point for post-WSIS substantive policy discussions. “Some civil society activists have argued that the IGF’s remit should be interpreted as broadly as possible, for example that it should reach beyond Internet governance to discuss issues of infrastructure deployment, applications development and information rights.”<sup>15</sup> Those concerned with mission creep diluting the IGF dialogue have been encouraging participants advocating for such ICT4D policy discussions to direct their energies to the Global Alliance for ICT4D (GAID). GAID, however, has not been an equivalent space for post-WSIS policy dialogue, having instead established itself as a programmatic/implementation body. While most IGF participants agree with the need to keep policy discussions relevant to elements of Internet governance, there is a concern that the forum is at risk of defining Internet governance far too narrowly at the expense of broad stakeholder engagement.

Rather than looking inwardly towards Internet governance institutions, development community participants feel the IGF needs to look more outwardly to the impacts Internet governance decisions will have on the global community. For example, an issue that has been vigorously debated at the IGF is whether, from a public policy perspective, the Internet should or could be seen as a fundamental and necessary service similar to other public goods like transportation infrastructure. If so, the possibility to establish a “Right to the Internet” as a guiding principle appears as a potential agenda item. Such a principle would have significant implications for defining “reasonable” access to the Internet. It is on this fundamental question that many see significant overlap with ICT4D objectives. Those concerned with ICT4D mission creep argue that access issues are the domain of national and regional policies rather than international or transnational global governance arrangements and, as such, should be taken up in other forums. Those seeing value in Internet governance that looks more outwardly argue that many multilateral and bilateral development-

---

<sup>14</sup> Accelerate Internet availability and affordability; strengthen and enhance the engagement of developing country stakeholders; capacity building for Internet governance in developing countries; and embodiment of WSIS principles in Internet governance processes. See <http://www.intgovforum.org/mandate.htm>.

<sup>15</sup> Souter, D. (2007). “Internet governance and development: Another digital divide?” *Information Polity*, Vol 12; Numb 1/2, pages 29–38.



oriented agencies are active in “access” issues and so discussion of global guidelines, priorities and standards would not be inconsistent with the IGF mandate. At the recent OECD Ministerial Meeting on the “Future of the Internet economy,” Viviane Reding, European Commissioner for Information Society and Media, expressed support for exploring this issue at the IGF:

This notion of the Internet as a “public utility” must continue to be a central guiding principle as we seek to ensure that its benefits are available to all and that it is protected from capture by any particular stakeholder group, whether it is particular governments or specific private sector interests ... This issue will certainly be deepened during the next meeting of the IGF that India will host in December.<sup>16</sup>

As the next section shows, this sentiment reflects the concerns of many stakeholders and, overall, of the MAG. It is worth noting, however, that, given the ambiguity regarding consideration of Internet’s role in development at the IGF, there is some doubt whether there is sufficient participation from all the necessary stakeholders to effectively incorporate Internet governance considerations into development thinking. According to David Souter, this “requires dialogue at national and international levels between three core groups of stakeholders: those primarily interested in and knowledgeable about technology; those primarily concerned and familiar with development sectors; and those with knowledge and understanding of development finance.” Souter questions whether the IGF in its current format is likely “to attract sufficient participation from those with expertise in these non-governance areas.”<sup>17</sup>

### 3. Themes and Basic Structure for IGF Hyderabad

The preliminary agenda suggested by the MAG in its second meeting report balances the two competing viewpoints mentioned above and is clearly more focused than the agendas for the two previous meetings. “Internet for All” was chosen as the overall theme for the Hyderabad meeting in analogy with UNESCO’s “Education for All” movement conceived at the World Conference on Education for All in 1990. The proposed agenda is as follows:

- Day 1: Reaching the next billion:
  - Access
  - Multilingualism
- Day 2: Promoting cyber-security and trust:

---

<sup>16</sup> Reding, Viviane (2008). Seizing the Opportunities of the Global Internet Economy - OECD Ministerial Meeting “Future of the Internet economy,” Seoul, Korea, 17–18 June 2008, <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/08/336&format=DOC&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>.

<sup>17</sup> Souter (2007).

- Are we losing the battle against cyber-crime?
- Fostering security, privacy and openness
- Day 3: Managing critical Internet resources
  - Transition from IPv4 to IPv6
  - Arrangements for Internet governance – global and national/regional
- Day 4: Emerging issues:
  - Taking Stock and the Way forward Workshops
  - The Internet of tomorrow – Innovation and the evolution of the Internet

The Hyderabad meeting will follow the same basic format of the previous meetings, but with a tighter linkage between the workshops and the main sessions. Each morning will feature two main session workshops—focused on the sub-themes listed above—to frame the thematic thread of the day. The Secretariat has asked that some workshop organizers consider merging their proposals with others of similar thematic focus and assist with organizing the main session workshops for a given sub-theme. These will be followed in the afternoon by a moderated plenary debate. In parallel, there will be general workshops, best practice forums, open forums and Dynamic Coalition meetings.

As with every reasonable compromise, everyone is equally unhappy with the agenda. Despite the intent of the MAG to recommend general themes and main sessions focused on specific issues rather than general overviews, many with a narrow view of IG feel that the proposed approach will result in a duplication of previous plenary discussions and failure to address more specific policy issues of Internet governance.<sup>18</sup> Those subscribing to the broader view of IG have expressed concern that any reference to “rights,” “duties” and “freedoms” has disappeared from the agenda. It has also been noted that none of the themes include the concepts of “openness” and “diversity” which are traditional draws for civil society, as well as the focus of many of the Dynamic Coalitions. One of the more cynical observations has been that this IGF seems focused on how to export technology into developing countries and how to implement effective law enforcement over the Internet.

### ***Reaching the next billion***

Initially the “Universalization of the Internet” had been considered by the MAG as a main theme for the meeting; however, it was deemed controversial, being potentially associated with dominant cultural schemes, as well as suggestive of universal access obligations and associated regulations for service providers. “Reaching the next billion” was felt to be more neutral and indicative of the “access for all” objective. Although development will again be considered a cross-cutting theme,

---

<sup>18</sup> The session on “Arrangements for Internet governance” is, however, considered an exception.

discussion of issues of most interest to the development community will take place at events associated with the “Reaching the next billion” theme.

**Access:** The title of this sub-theme was originally “Low cost sustainable access.” It has since been simplified to “Access” in response to comments that the words “low cost” imply a narrow consideration of market-based mechanisms for reaching the next billion. Merging several workshop proposals is an option under consideration for the main workshop on this theme. Possible topics include: the predominant role of mobiles in providing access to the next billion; alternative models for reaching end users (e.g., networks supported by power and rail services); and the pros and cons of market-based competition versus co-operation/multistakeholder approaches to achieving access for the next billion. The Association for Progressive Communications (APC), Canada’s International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Link Centre, African Internet Service Providers, Panos London, the Centre for Science Development and Media Studies (CSDMS), the Pacific Islands Chapter of the Internet Society (PICISOC) and others awaiting confirmation, are assisting the Secretariat with the organization of this possible main session workshop.

It is important to note that the issue of access was a point of focus of the first two IGF meetings for civil society and the Internet community, particularly APC, the Internet Society (ISOC) and their partners. In a recent publication, APC presented an observation that there “was the semblance of convergence of opinion and recommendations on how the availability, accessibility and affordability of the Internet can be improved upon in the developing world.” They identified three main areas in which opinions were seen to converge:<sup>19</sup>

- The competitive (market) model as being effective in increasing access in developing countries;
- The applicability of collaborative models for providing access in areas where traditional market models seem to have failed; and
- The potential of ICTs as tools for development.

APC has indicated that they are considering the presentation of a kind of manifesto that would capture this emerging multistakeholder consensus around access to the Internet at the IGF in Hyderabad. They have already consulted ISOC, the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) and its Business Action to Support the Information Society (BASIS) initiative, and they are considering approaching the governments of India, Egypt, Japan, Brazil and Switzerland. The goal would be to

---

<sup>19</sup> Jagun, Abiodun (2008). “Building Consensus on Internet Access at the IGF,” APC Issue Papers, <http://www.apc.org/en/pubs/issue/openaccess/all/building-consensus-internet-access-igf>.

stage a multistakeholder presentation of this manifesto as a special event in Hyderabad and give participants the opportunity to add their support.

Despite the apparent progress this convergence represents, APC feels that significant work remains to be done on “tools” and implementation procedures/processes of solutions for resolving the well understood issues and challenges of access.<sup>20</sup> To make progress in this regard, APC is proposing that discussions on access now focus on generating and articulating implementation recommendations, a step that would be consistent with the mandate of the IGF.<sup>21</sup> APC proposes that the IGF Secretariat consider convening working groups to develop recommendations emerging from multistakeholder consensus on access issues that could be communicated to the Internet community at large, or addressed to specific institutions.<sup>22</sup>

**Multilingualism:** While not widely discussed, this workshop will likely be a technical discussion on Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) and country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs), along with some discussion of Internet language barrier issues and consideration of how to achieve a multilingual global Internet. The Chinese Domain Name Users Alliance, the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), the Asia-Pacific Regional At-Large Organization (APRALO), At-Large Structure Representatives (ALSes), ICANN, the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), UNESCO, ISOC, the Government of India, the Kuwait Information Technology Society, Naturhistoriska riksmuseet and others awaiting confirmation, are assisting the Secretariat with the organization of this main session workshop.

### ***Promoting cyber-security and trust***

The topics to be discussed under the theme of “Promoting cyber-security and trust” embody the “delicate balance to be struck between security, privacy and openness, and the moral, legal and policy choices society will need to make”<sup>23</sup> with regards to the management of the Internet.

**Are we losing the battle against cyber-crime?:** This theme considers the main threats to the World Wide Web such as cyber-crime; the use of the Internet for terrorism; and the use of the Internet for activities incompatible with international safety and security. The following organizations have tentatively agreed to assist the Secretariat with organizing the main session workshop for this sub-theme: the World Information Technology Services Alliance (WITSA),

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Specifically: “Advising all stakeholders in proposing ways and means to accelerate the availability and affordability of the Internet in the developing world.” See <http://www.intgovforum.org/mandate.htm>.

<sup>22</sup> Jagun (2008).

<sup>23</sup> Paper on the program, agenda and format of the Hyderabad meeting, 5 June 2008, [http://www.intgovforum.org/hyderabad\\_prog/ProgrammePaper.05.06.2008.pdf](http://www.intgovforum.org/hyderabad_prog/ProgrammePaper.05.06.2008.pdf).

DiploFoundation, ITU, the Council of Europe, the Global Internet Policy Initiative (GIPI), the Internet Society of Bulgaria, ISOC and the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, along with others awaiting confirmation.

**Fostering security, privacy and openness:** There is a wide range of topics in workshop proposals under this theme. The main session workshop will likely explore topics such as balancing online child protection with freedom of expression and privacy; the latest advances in privacy-enhancing technologies; the protection of personal data and the threat of cyber-crime; self-regulation versus coordinated or direct regulation of content; content regulations on the Internet and sexual rights of women and youth; and the harmonization of privacy and data protection rules at the global level. The following organizations have tentatively agreed to assist the Secretariat with organizing the main session workshop for this sub-theme: the Children’s Charities’ Coalition on Internet Safety (CHIS), the Microsoft Technology Office, Technical University Delft, Privacy International, the German Government, the Council of Europe, the NGO Alliance for Child Safety Online (NACSO), APC, the French Commission for UNESCO, UNESCO and *Commission nationale de l’informatique et des libertés* (CNIL –the “French Data Protection Authority”) and others awaiting confirmation.

### ***Managing critical Internet resources***

The theme “Managing critical Internet resources (CIRs)” is considered by some, arguably the most vocal, participants to encompass the most crucial Internet governance challenges. The handling of the first official debate at the IGF on this theme at last year’s meeting in Rio was seen by many as validation of the ability of the IGF format to address difficult topics. There is rough consensus that managing critical Internet resources refers to the management of the operational issues, stability and security of domain name systems, root servers and Internet protocol addresses. The issues of managing CIRs become most contentious in debates around their global governance, or lack thereof. Since the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS), many advocates for CIRs governance reform have protested the perceived unilateral control of Internet resources by the U.S. and via the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Those with a narrow view of Internet governance have more or less set their sights on making progress on this front. Given the hegemonic undertones of these mainly U.S.-centric policy issues, their focus has understandably dominated much of the media—and, therefore, public—attention on Internet governance, much to the disappointment of those espousing a broader view of IG. With that said, beyond the politics of control, there are a number of CIR issues that have very important public policy implications. They are:

- Pending shortage of IPv4 Internet addresses;
- Risks of severe economic and technical dislocations during the transition from IPv4 to IPv6;
- Security of the domain name system (DNS); and

- New challenges resulting from the creation of new and multilingual top-level domains (TLDs), specifically: a) global content regulations, b) fracturing of the Internet into national Internets, c) means for controlling language communities, and d) risks of DNS service market dominance.

On the surface, the proposed agenda for IGF Hyderabad creates sufficient space for discussing and debating most of these issues, allowing them one full day, although those with a narrow view of IG would prefer much more time.

**Transition from IPv4 to IPv6:** The main session workshop for this CIR sub-theme will focus on several aspects of this issue: readiness of Internet-poor countries in upgrading themselves to IPv6; critical examination of steps to be initiated for migration to IPv6; and compatibility between two versions—whether network hardware can be modified or needs to be manufactured afresh. The following organizations have tentatively agreed to assist the Secretariat with this sub-theme: the Japan Network Information Center (JPNIC), the Number Resource Organization (NRO), ISOC, Internet Association Japan (IA Japan), the Japan Internet Service Providers Association (JAIPA), the Institute for InfoSocionomics – Tama University, the Government of Japan, ITU, Réseaux IP Européens (RIPE – “European IP Networks”) and the Internet Governance Project (IGP), along with others awaiting confirmation.

**Arrangements for Internet governance – global and national/regional:** There has been surprisingly little activity on merging proposals for this main session workshop, despite the fact that there seems to be no shortage of workshop proposals that could be characterized as “Arrangements for Internet governance.” That this has not been happening could be a function of ambiguity regarding what exactly should be discussed under this main session workshop title. Given that this sub-theme has been placed within the theme of managing CIRs, an obvious topic of discussion would be arrangements for global and national/regional governance of CIRs; however, this is a very politically charged topic so it would not be surprising if participants are waiting from some further guidance from the MAG and the Secretariat. So far, the only topic on the table is bottom-up policy-making in the regional Internet registries to address IPv4 depletion and IPv6 transition, with Packet Clearing House having tentatively agreed to help the Secretariat with preparations. An update of further developments is expected no later than mid-September.

### ***Emerging issues***

As has been the case with the first and second IGF meetings, the emerging issues sessions are expected to allow for a degree of improvisation. At previous meeting, these sessions have served the very valuable purpose of providing a forum for presenting and debating feedback on the IGF proceedings and discussing and debating issues which may feature prominent in future IGF

meetings. In other words, they have given participants the opportunity to strategize their future engagement with the IGF accordingly.

One exception with this year's meeting is the high interest in the topic "The Internet of tomorrow: Innovation and the evolution of the Internet." Development issues can be seen as crucial under this umbrella. In particular, there is the suggestion from the MAG that this discussion focus on exploring "how the innovation potential of the Internet and its governance can be better explored by small and medium businesses, especially from the developing world."<sup>24</sup> Further details are expected after the next consultation meeting in September.

#### 4. Development Focus of Remaining Workshop Proposals

Workshop proposals not being considered for merger under a main session workshop are to be scheduled in timeslots parallel to the main session workshops and debates. Compared to last year's 35 workshops, there will a significant whittling down of the remaining proposals, currently numbering 83, through mergers, or simply by not being granted a timeslot. Details regarding workshop proposals can be found at the IGF Web site.<sup>25</sup> Approximately 25 per cent of the remaining workshops deal with issues and subject matters of direct interest and relevance to the development community in their handling of ICT4D, Internet governance for development (IG4D) or ICT governance issues. Those dealing with ICT4D issues and subject matter are covering (lead organizers included in brackets):

- Access via ultra-low priced PCs, mobiles and networks (École Nationale Supérieure de Techniques Avancées – ENSTA)
- Freedom of information for development (UNESCO)
- National information policies for achieving MDGs (Council of Europe)
- Franchise models of shared-access provision (Digital Empowerment Foundation)
- Promoting pro-poor access to ICTs (APC)
- ICT security basics for Africa (Agence Nationale de la Sécurité Informatique - ANSI)
- Capacity building to facilitate access for the next billion (Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Finland)

Those dealing with IG4D issues and subject matter are covering:

- How access can facilitate the growth and development of ccTLDs in developing countries (Africa Top Level Domains Organization – AFTLD)

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> See "Workshop list" at [http://www.intgovforum.org/workshops\\_08/wrkshplist.php](http://www.intgovforum.org/workshops_08/wrkshplist.php).

- Challenges facing Internet operators providing access in developing countries (Asia Pacific Network Information Centre – APNIC)
- Internet exchange points (IXPs) and their role in access costs (ICT Strategies, mCADE llc)
- Service provider operator challenges and issues of providing connectivity (Pacific Islands Telecommunications Association - PITTA)
- Issues and challenges facing developing countries – information security, spam, electronic governance and data protection (CYBERLAWS.NET)
- Importance of Online Dispute Resolution for bringing benefits to developing areas (Chinese Domain Name Users Alliance)
- Role of IXPs in creating Internet capacity and bringing autonomy to developing nations (Packet Clearing House)
- Net neutrality debate primer for developing countries (DiploFoundation)
- Internet Governance Capacity Building Programme – IGCBP (DiploFoundation)
- Using scenarios to map the relationship between IG and other global challenges (International Institute for Sustainable Development – IISD)
- Formulating a development agenda for Internet governance (Graduate Institute for International and Development Studies)

Those dealing with ICT governance issues and subject matter are covering:

- International ICT standardization (Sun Microsystems)
- National communication networks – best practices (The Swedish Post and Telecom Agency)

### ***Formulating a development agenda for internet governance***

The following IG4D initiative started at last year's IGF in Rio is worth special mention, given the broad support it has been receiving from civil society attendees. Along with the actions of advocates for consideration of "Access" issues, efforts by Bill Drake, Director of the Project on the Information Revolution and Global Governance at the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva, to create a development agenda for Internet governance have formed an invaluable beachhead for the consideration of development by IGF participants and the broader IG community. This initiative is focused specifically on mainstreaming development considerations into the procedures and policy outputs of global governance mechanisms, in a manner analogous to



similar initiatives with international trade and intellectual property bodies. This year's workshop aims to address two questions:<sup>26</sup>

- What would be the substantive focus of a development agenda?
- What would be the operational aspects of establishing and promoting such an agenda?

### ***Internet governance and sustainable development***

IISD believes that the evolution of the Internet and sustainable development are inextricably linked. For sustainable development to take hold effectively and efficiently it must harness the institutions and tools made possible by the Internet; and for the Internet to sustain itself, its evolution must be managed in a manner mindful of the “limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment’s ability to meet present and future needs.”<sup>27</sup> At last year’s meeting in Rio, IISD kicked off an initiative to bring more clarity to the linkages between Internet governance and sustainable development at the IGF with the launch of its book “Internet Governance and Sustainable Development: Towards a common agenda.”<sup>28</sup> As a follow up for IGF Hyderabad, IISD submitted a proposal that one of its plenary sessions be devoted to “exploring the linkages between Internet governance and sustainable development.” The proposal was based on the following rationale:<sup>29</sup>

- The IGF Chairman recognized links with sustainable development as an emerging issue at the Rio meeting;
- There has been a groundswell of international dialogue regarding the linkages between the Internet, information and communication technologies, and issues of sustainable development; and
- It would be an opportunity for the IGF to demonstrate the relevance of IG to broader international concerns.

While the MAG concluded that “the linkages between Internet governance and sustainable development and the inclusion of sustainable development were not yet mature enough in an IGF

---

<sup>26</sup> For more details, see the proposal for “A Development Agenda for Internet Governance: From Principle to Practice” at [http://www.intgovforum.org/workshops\\_08/showmelist.php?mem=15](http://www.intgovforum.org/workshops_08/showmelist.php?mem=15).

<sup>27</sup> See “What is Sustainable Development,” <http://www.iisd.org/sd/>.

<sup>28</sup> IISD (2007). “Internet Governance and Sustainable Development: Towards a common agenda,” [http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2008/igsd\\_common\\_agenda\\_bg.pdf](http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2008/igsd_common_agenda_bg.pdf).

<sup>29</sup> See IISD’s submission to 1<sup>st</sup> preparatory consultation for IGF III at [http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2008/backgroundunder\\_igf\\_new\\_delhi.pdf](http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2008/backgroundunder_igf_new_delhi.pdf).

context to be included as a key theme for the main sessions, their conclusion was that these issues should first be further developed in workshops.”<sup>30</sup>

IISD also proposed a workshop in Hyderabad that would provide a space for examining early conclusions from an initiative to use global scenarios to map the relationship between IG and other global challenges. Besides IISD, partners for this initiative and the workshop so far include APC, Industry Canada, the Finnish Parliament’s Committee for the Future, The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) and Fujitsu. The initiative also has the endorsement of ISOC. The workshop, entitled “Can Internet governance change global futures? Or will global futures change Internet governance?” will use scenarios thinking to map the relationship between Internet Governance and other global challenges.<sup>31</sup>

It is quite possible that forces outside of the Internet development community will influence public and private sector policies that may determine how the Internet is managed. These external forces will include global insecurity, vulnerable energy systems, failure of democratic governance movements and so forth; but also positive trends related to globalization and the emergence of economic powers. The scenarios methodology will explore what those external forces might be; how they might impact decisions about Internet governance; and what the most positive outcomes for Internet governance might be as a result. This exploration in and of itself should be of significant interest to the IGF, and it relates to both policy recommendations under the themes “Reaching the next billion” and “Promoting cyber-security and trust.”

The scenarios methodology is also promising for exploring the linkages back to sustainable development. Sustainable development is about the needs of the poor; it is about good governance; and it is about the possibilities of technology and social organization to protect the ecosystem. Those external forces that could be major impediments or catalysts to good governance and management of the Internet are also forces for or against global sustainability. Good Internet policy might actually help to overcome those impediments, for the good of the Internet and the good of the world. But weaker Internet policy decisions might simply reinforce trends to an unsustainable future. The scenarios approach will help to identify the implications of policy choices facing those with an interest in and responsibility for the future of the Internet. This frame of reference will be helpful in justifying to the rest of the international community why the challenge of Internet governance must be taken seriously and approached with due diligence and care.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Paper on the program, agenda and format of the Hyderabad meeting, 5 June 2008, [http://www.intgovforum.org/hyderabad\\_prog/ProgrammePaper.05.06.2008.pdf](http://www.intgovforum.org/hyderabad_prog/ProgrammePaper.05.06.2008.pdf).

<sup>31</sup> See workshop proposal at [http://www.intgovforum.org/workshops\\_08/showmelist.php?mem=80](http://www.intgovforum.org/workshops_08/showmelist.php?mem=80).

<sup>32</sup> Thanks to Heather Creech, Director of Knowledge Communications, IISD for this formulation.

In addition to this scenarios initiative, IISD will also be participating in other activities at IGF Hyderabad relevant to the objectives of sustainable development which include:

- A Dynamic Coalition on Internet and Climate Change being initiated by the ITU<sup>33</sup>
- A workshop entitled “The Internet of things: How to reach the first billion of objects” initiated by GS1.<sup>34</sup> IISD will be representing the very important implications the Internet of things (sensor networks and RFID) has for the environment and other dimensions of sustainability, touching on example applications that could advance sustainability objectives in issues areas such as climate change, energy, resources, security and trade.
- A workshop entitled “ICTs and an Environmentally Sustainable Internet: Another challenge of connecting the next billion Internet users” initiated by the Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC).<sup>35</sup>

## 5. Dynamic Coalitions

Dynamic Coalitions (DCs) differ from workshops in that they represent informal gatherings of stakeholders interested in a particular issue, which may engage in debates or joint work projects outside of the confines of the IGF and report on its activities to the IGF community at the annual meetings. Many Dynamic Coalitions are civil society-led and hope to address the problem of the growing digital divide. As such, they often draw on the recommendations of the WSIS Tunis Agenda, and deal with Internet issues having to do with “openness” and “diversity.” What follows is a summary of Dynamic Coalitions that may be of interest to development practitioners. Further details regarding these Dynamic Coalitions can be found at the IGF Web site.<sup>36</sup>

**StopSpamAlliance:** This is a joint initiative to gather information and resources on combating spam. This initiative was undertaken by Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the EU’s Contact Network of Spam Authorities (CNSA), ITU, the London Action Plan, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Seoul-Melbourne Anti-Spam group. They maintain an up-to-date information-sharing blog, but aside from this there is little information available on any joint activities outside of the IGF. Last year’s meeting at the IGF appeared geared towards providing updates on each other’s activities. The plans of StopSpamAlliance for Hyderabad are not readily available at this time.

<sup>33</sup> See “Dynamic Coalition on the Internet and Climate Change” details at [http://www.intgovforum.org/dynamic\\_coalitions.php?listy=15](http://www.intgovforum.org/dynamic_coalitions.php?listy=15).

<sup>34</sup> See “The Internet of things: how to reach the first billion of objects” workshop details at [http://www.intgovforum.org/workshops\\_08/showmelist.php?mem=44](http://www.intgovforum.org/workshops_08/showmelist.php?mem=44).

<sup>35</sup> See “ICTs and an Environmentally Sustainable Internet: Another Challenge of Connecting the Next Billion Internet Users” workshop details at [http://www.intgovforum.org/workshops\\_08/showmelist.php?mem=62](http://www.intgovforum.org/workshops_08/showmelist.php?mem=62).

<sup>36</sup> See “Dynamic Coalitions” at <http://www.intgovforum.org/Dynamic%20Coalitions.php>.

**Dynamic Coalition on Privacy:** The Dynamic Coalition on Privacy is addressing emerging issues of Internet privacy protection such as digital identities, the link between privacy and development, and the importance of privacy and anonymity for freedom of expression. It aims at developing a set of recommendations for the IGF to consider. As of 21 November 2007, the DC had 72 members. The DC was quite active in 2007 having posted quarterly progress reports and releasing three issue papers: Privacy and Identity; Privacy and Development; and Privacy and Freedom of Expression. Preparations for Hyderabad appear less intensive with only some of the members having co-organized a workshop proposal entitled “Policy Aspects of Privacy Enhancing Technologies (PETs).” The Dynamic Coalition on Privacy is still however planning to meet in Hyderabad.

**Dynamic Coalition on Open Standards:** The Dynamic Coalition on Open Standards (DCOS) focuses on the most urgent problems related to open technology standards and application interoperability and suggests straightforward, workable solutions that can be implemented by all stakeholders. In support of Paragraph 90j of the Tunis Agenda, the DCOS focuses on best practices in government policy and procurement practices for public documents and services; paying particular attention to the needs of developing economies, including capacity building, technology transfer, access and other requirements. The DCOS has been consistently active since its inception in IGF Athens having published on government policy and procurement best practices; issue papers on open documents as well as IT standards; and contributions to the IGF synthesis papers. In preparation for Hyderabad, the DCOS steering committee members have organized two workshop proposals: “Knowledge as a Global Public Good: How fair use, open source and ICT standards can expand digital inclusion”; and “Reforming the International ICT Standardization System.”

**Dynamic Coalition on Access and Connectivity for Rural, Remote and Dispersed Communities:** This DC aims to specifically consider the access and connectivity issues and challenges facing remote, rural and dispersed communities around the world. Its objectives are:

- To create an open multistakeholder forum to consider access/connectivity issues and challenges facing remote, rural and dispersed communities;
- To highlight and promote solutions by way of case studies and best practices;
- To explore and promote public-private partnership in delivering appropriate solutions; and
- To ensure the principle of Universal Access for all is an integral part of IGF and its deliberations.

According to their Rio event report, this DC plans on brainstorming via discussion group prior to Hyderabad on ways in which action can be taken to continue to extend access in a manner that assures Internet diffusion beyond urban areas and in unserved and underserved regions. Some ideas

suggested included engaging people from industry to join the DC in Hyderabad. It is mentioned in a workshop proposal submitted by the Pacific Islands Chapter of the Internet Society (PICISOC) entitled “Universalization of the Internet: How to reach the next billion” that members from the Dynamic Coalition on Access and Connectivity will be invited to join the workshop. Aside from this any other plans this DC has for a presence at IGF Hyderabad are not readily available at this time.

**Dynamic Coalition on the Internet Bill of Rights:** This DC aims to understand how traditional human rights can be adapted and expanded in the new online environment, and how they could be formalized in one or more documents that could act as a reference and be adopted as a code of conduct on an opt-in basis. Its membership includes government ministries, law schools, and NGOs. The DC was quite active in 2007 and released a statement outlining a vision, a mission and some future actions at the first IGF consultation meeting for Hyderabad. Their vision is a “bill of rights” as a set of several documents, some existing, some new; some substantial, some procedural or related to enforcement. These documents are expected to contribute to their mission in the following ways:

- Bring awareness and promote fundamental human and civil rights and liberties on the Internet;
- Identify ways in which these rights and liberties can be translated on the Internet, and evaluate the applicability of existing legislation;
- Promote the addressing of issues of human and civil rights in policy-making proposals by all stakeholders;
- Promote the specification of how the existing rights can be applied and what they practically imply in the context of new ICT technologies;
- Identify ways in which new rights and principles deriving from the innovations caused by the Internet can be defined, agreed and promoted when necessary;
- Seek to identify measures for the protection and enforcement of these rights; and
- Seek to engage the various stakeholders within the Coalition's mission and express the Coalition's interest to work with them.

Two members of the DC, Robin Gross and Robert Guerra, were recently interviewed by CBC's radio show “Search Engine” where they discussed the activities of the DC.<sup>37</sup> This DC has also

---

<sup>37</sup> “The Internet Bill of Rights,” Search Engine, CBC Radio, 17 April 2008, [http://www.cbc.ca/searchengine/blog/2008/04/the\\_internet\\_bill\\_of\\_rights\\_pt.html](http://www.cbc.ca/searchengine/blog/2008/04/the_internet_bill_of_rights_pt.html) & [http://www.cbc.ca/searchengine/blog/2008/04/internet\\_bill\\_of\\_rights\\_pt2\\_co.html](http://www.cbc.ca/searchengine/blog/2008/04/internet_bill_of_rights_pt2_co.html).

proposed a workshop for Hyderabad entitled “Best practices and lessons learned: Mainstreaming human rights in the work of the dynamic coalitions.”

**Dynamic Coalition for Linguistic Diversity:** The Dynamic Coalition for Linguistic Diversity is partnered with the World Network for Linguistic Diversity MAAYA, which is overseen by the President of the PrepCom of the WSIS Geneva Phase, with the MAAYA network acting as coalition coordinator. The goals of the Coalition stem from recommendations 29 and 53 of the Tunis Agenda in regards to Internet governance, which take aim to: ensure multilingualism is taken into account in the functioning of the Internet; and multilingualization of the Internet, as part of a multilateral, transparent and democratic process. The World Network for Linguistic Diversity MAAYA was also designated as the lead moderator for the Linguistic Diversity theme within Action Line C8 Cultural and Linguistic Diversity of the Geneva Plan of Action. The goals of the World Network for Linguistic Diversity MAAYA are:

- Encourage civil society, the private sector, research institutions and NGOs, as well as governments and organizations, to adopt and implement measures enhancing equitable multilingualism;
- Promote mother-tongue-based multilingual education that contributes to value the capacity of free linguistic and cultural expression of the community in order to guarantee both social and gender equality;
- Promote software localization and equal access of all languages to cyberspace;
- Facilitate the empowerment of language communities worldwide in developing and defending their own languages and its usage;
- Contribute to the creation and sharing of language resources; and
- Observe the implementation of language policies, ensure technological monitoring and serve as a focal point for linguistic research projects.

The plans of the Dynamic Coalition for Linguistic Diversity for Hyderabad are not readily available at this time.

**A2K@IGF Dynamic Coalition (Access to Knowledge):** The purpose of the A2K@IGF Dynamic Coalition is to support and expand Access to Knowledge (A2K) and promote freedom of expression in the realm of information and communication technology. This Dynamic Coalition focuses on the following issues:

- Developing best practice norms for:
  - limitations and exceptions to copyright, patents and other intellectual property rights;

- third-party liability for intellectual property infringements;
  - implementation of anti-circumvention provisions in the 1996 World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty (WIPO/WCT) and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty (WPPT) and other international agreements;
  - online access to scholarly research, government-funded research and essential documents such as legal information;
  - the support of alternative business models for creating knowledge goods, including free and open software, or open scholarly and scientific journals; and
  - protecting access to freedom of expression and cultural diversity in issues relating to intellectual property rights.
- Coordinating participation and awareness of A2K activities at related fora, such as the WIPO Development Agenda or the WIPO proposals for an A2K Treaty.

This Dynamic Coalition has been active since its formation at the inaugural meeting of the IGF in 2006. The Dynamic Coalition is not organizing any workshops at Hyderabad however in a statement at the May consultation the A2K@IGF coalition indicated that they welcome a discussion in Hyderabad that explores best practices for promoting sharing of knowledge and access to information and that explores a variety of business models designed to encourage creativity and innovation.

**Dynamic Coalition on Freedom of Expression and Freedom of the Media on the Internet (FOEonline):** The “Free Expression Online” Coalition was established as a follow-up to the first IGF in 2006. It aims to further freedom of expression and the media on the Internet. It aims to provide an open platform to exchange information, advance initiatives in the field of Internet governance and freedom of expression and serve as an informal community to organize meetings and other initiatives. For Hyderabad, the DC on FOE has proposed a workshop entitled “Freedom of Expression in Cyberspace: Internet filtering and censorship.”

**Dynamic Coalition on Gender and Internet Governance (GIG):** The Dynamic Coalition on Gender Equality aims to ensure gender perspective is included in the key debates around Internet governance issues, such as content regulation, privacy, access, and freedom of expression among others. Among other activities, the coalition wants to promote women’s visibility at the IGF and related fora; to conduct research and provide input on the main topics of the IGF debates; to support capacity building of gender advocates; and to promote more effective linkages among local, regional and global initiatives on gender and information society. This DC meet in IGF Rio however their plans for Hyderabad are not readily available at this time.

**Dynamic Coalition on a Framework of Principles for the Internet:** This Dynamic Coalition seeks to understand, influence and contribute to the processes of making international laws,

conventions, treaties, etc. in the area of Internet governance—both of the soft law and hard law varieties—incorporating the multistakeholder principle. For this purpose, the coalition also seeks to explore the possibility of civil society taking the lead in collaboratively developing some overall normative principles for the Internet which can underpin such international processes, and/or themselves be adopted through a framework convention kind of a process. This DC met in IGF Rio, however their plans for Hyderabad are not readily available at this time.