IGF
Internet Governance Forum

CONNECTING CONTINENTS FOR ENHANCED MULTISTAKEHOLDER INTERNET GOVERNANCE

The 9th Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

2-5 September 2014 | Istanbul, Turkey

**IGF 2014: Connecting Continents
for Enhanced Multistakeholder Internet Governance**

The Ninth Meeting of the Internet Governance Forum

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

DESA Mission Statement

The Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat is a vital interface between global policies in the economic, social and environmental spheres and national action. The Department works in three main interlinked areas: (i) it compiles, generates and analyses a wide range of economic, social and environmental data and information on which Member States of the United Nations draw to review common problems and to take stock of policy options; (ii) it facilitates the negotiations of Member States in many intergovernmental bodies on joint courses of action to address ongoing or emerging global challenges; and (iii) it advises interested Governments on the ways and means of translating policy frameworks developed in United Nations conferences and summits into programmes at the country level and, through technical assistance, helps build national capacities.

Note

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The term 'country' as used in the text of this publication also refers, as appropriate, to territories and areas.

The designations "developed" and "developing economies" are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily imply a judgment about the stage reached by a particular country or area in the development process.

Mention of the name of any company, organization, product or website does not imply endorsement on the part of the United Nations.

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures.

Contents

1. Message from Under-Secretary-General Mr. Wu Hongbo

With the theme of "Connecting Continents for Enhanced Multistakeholder Internet Governance", the ninth Internet Governance Forum (IGF) (2-5 September 2014, Istanbul, Turkey) reflected the continuous value of the IGF. Held in a year marked by growing global attention to Internet governance, the ninth IGF demonstrated again that it provides a unique space that creates synergies among policy debates at the global level, as well as an important platform for exchange of experience and best practice.

Acting upon the recommendations of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum, the IGF featured a number of innovations and more concrete outcomes. These include the outcome documents of the five Best Practice Forums and a more substantive Chair's Summary. There were also recommendations for further improvements to the inter-sessional work in the period before the IGF 2015 meeting. These enhancements demonstrate that the IGF is willing to evolve, within the limits of its mandate as defined by the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society, in order to better fulfill its functions and serve the global community.

More than 2000 participants from different parts of the world gathered in Istanbul. Together with the several hundred online participants, they engaged in multi-stakeholder debates on current and emerging issues related to the Internet, organized under eight sub-themes and through over 100 workshops. The topics ranged from the digital divide to digital trust, from management of critical Internet resources to network neutrality, from cyber-security to jurisdictional issues, among others.

Representatives of governments, intergovernmental organizations, private sector, civil society and technical community also discussed the continuing value of the IGF, the overall evolution of the multi-stakeholder Internet governance arrangements, and the 2015 ten-year review of the outcome of the World Summit on the Information Society. This publication contains a summary and the proceedings from the 2014 IGF.

The success of the ninth IGF was due, in no small part, to the hard work and dedication of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG). I extend my appreciation to the MAG for its commitment to the success of the IGF. I also recognize the critical contribution of the global IGF community, including the various stakeholders who continue to believe in the IGF and who contribute their time and efforts to improving it each year. I have no doubt that the IGF will continue to evolve and serve as an inclusive and comprehensive platform for dialogue among stakeholders in the Internet governance ecosystem.

Thank you.

2.   Introduction and Acknowledgements

This is the ninth volume of the annual Internet Governance Forum (IGF) proceedings produced by the IGF Secretariat since the first meeting in Athens in 2006. The production of this book is part of the Secretariat's mandate, which was established during the creation of the IGF itself. It is a way to capture important institutional memory of the discussions and debates during the now thousands of sessions that have taken place within the IGF in its first nine years. This book is also the first volume of proceedings to be published since the IGF Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group decided to encourage more tangible outputs from the annual IGF. The decision to evolve the format of the proceedings was prompted by both the ongoing organic development of the IGF as well as by the recommendations of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) Working Group on Improvements to the IGF. The major change in format is the separation of high level reporting of the forum (Part 1 of the book) from the original documentation (Part 2). This change in structure was made with the objective of enabling readers to more easily be able to digest the outcomes of the meeting. Readers wanting to access the more detailed source material from the meeting can then refer to the reference materials contained in the second part of the book. Readers wishing to skim through the transcripts in the reference material are also aided, for the first time, by "pull quotes", which enable readers to scan the pages, alight upon an interesting quote in a grey box, then choose to read about the topic more deeply in the surrounding text.

Part 1 contains an overview of the preparatory process, discussion at the meeting, as well as points of convergence and divergence and any recommendations that were suggested during discussions. The Chair's Summary of the meeting, prepared immediately after the close of the meeting by the IGF Secretariat using a new, more accessible style, is also included in Part 1. Reports of the discussion at the meeting are arranged, first, by sub-theme, with main/focus sessions that fell outside the formal IGF 2014 sub-themes reported after the sub-themes. To make it easier for readers to navigate the summary on each topic of discussion, standard signposts have been used (for example, "Areas where consensus is emerging" and "Comparison of discussion at IGF 2015 with previous IGF discussions"). The section, "Conclusions drawn from the workshop and possible follow up actions" from workshop reports have been included as part of the "Community suggestions and recommendations on ways forward" section of the report on each IGF 2014 sub-theme. These extracts from workshop reports, for the most part, are included as submitted by the organizers though lightly edited and formatted to keep them consistent.

Part 2, orginal reference materials from IGF 2014, contains a summary of documents and publications that were launched at IGF 2014 or produced during the meeting itself. Transcripts of the main sessions, which in previous editions of the IGF book were included after each of the reports on meeting discussins, have been moved to Part 2. Given the change in structure, there has been a different focus on the editing of the transcripts where compared to previous versions of the IGF book. In particular, for this book, there was a greater emphasis on identifying all speakers whose names were missing in the "verbatim" transcripts and ensuring the correct names of technologies, policies, laws and initiatives appear in the transcripts. In comparison to previous years, for the 2014 IGF book, editing of the tran-

scripts to eliminate introductory statements, thank you remarks, repetitive and off-topic comments and opinions, personal stories and exchanges has been kept to a minimum. Transcripts contain both verbatim records of participants who spoke in English as well as English translations of those who spoke in one of the other UN official languages and Turkish. Therefore, just as in the previous publications, some statements may be easier to understand and more clearly written than others. But we hope what was captured most significantly was the exchange of opinions and ideas that make the IGF deliberations so exceptional. Part 2 ends with IGF 2014 onsite attendance statistics and a short glossary of Internet governance terms for much of the sometimes complex technical language that is used.

2.1.   Acknowledgements

3. Introduction by the Host Country, Republic of Turkey

Turkey is proud to have hosted the ninth IGF in Istanbul 2-5 September 2014, the largest IGF held to date, attracting over 3,500 participants, of whom approximately 2,400 were on-site and 1,100 were online. With the overarching theme of 'Connecting Continents for Enhanced Multi-stakeholder Internet Governance', which drew inspiration from Istanbul's unique location where two continents meet, IGF 2014 introduced a number of innovations to its format and methods of working, as is evidenced by this book of the meeting's proceedings.

Minister of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications of Turkey performed the role of Chair in IGF 2014 on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Turkey. Through the week of IGF 2014, pioneers, leaders and prominent experts came together and exchanged their views and ideas on a variety of Internet-related issues. Lively debates and the maturity of discussions drew close attention and interest of participants. At the main sessions, workshops and other events, hot topics and issues in the world agenda concerning Internet governance were discussed in an open and interactive manner. Innovation in the format of the sessions contributed to inclusive and fruitful discussions that developed possible ways forward for many of the issues discussed. IGF 2014 was the remarkable event where young people's voices were clearly heard by the leaders of governments and other stakeholder groups. Young people emphasized at IGF 2014 that they are one of the important stakeholders in Internet governance discussions.

On the day before the official IGF began, as the host country of the IGF 2014, Turkey upheld the now well-established IGF tradition of hosting a High Level Leaders Meeting. The Government of Turkey invited leaders from ministers of United Nations Member States and a diverse group of leaders from international organizations and the private sector to discuss the theme, 'Capacity Building for Economic Development'. Chairman of the Board of Information and Communication Technologies Authority (ICTA) chaired the meeting and highlighted Turkey's increased access to technology as a sign of the country's improved development. It was noted by the Chairman that the IGF is a very important event that brings together a diverse group of stakeholders to consider the future of the Internet. The Deputy Prime Minister, ministers, deputy ministers and high level leaders from different countries participated to this meeting and expressed their views and ideas on the subject. The high level leaders examined how providing access to information and communications technologies, including the Internet, could improve people's lives and develop their capacity.

Also, in Istanbul, IGF participants enjoyed the IGF Village where national and international businesses, organizations and civil society foundations showcased their activities and shared their views and ideas on a wide variety of Internet governance issues. The IGF Village was a centre of attraction for participants and contributed greatly to the success of the meeting.

At this point, let me provide a brief overview of the preparations for IGF 2014. The journey toward this successful event started at the end of 2013. Under the leadership of the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications of the Republic of Turkey, ICTA of Turkey conducted overall preparatory studies and dedicated much time and extensive efforts to ensure a successful IGF.

There was close cooperation between UNDESA and Turkey throughout the preparations and the Government of Turkey signed the Host Country Agreement with the United Nations regarding the arrangements for IGF 2014. Turkey was an active member of the international community's preparations for the meeting, serving as honorary chair in Open Consultations and MAG Meetings.

During the preparations, national coordination meetings were conducted in Turkey with the participation of relevant ministries, government institutions and organizations. They extended full support and commitment for smooth execution of the IGF. As the host country, the Government of Turkey hosted multi-stakeholder meetings in which government institutions, academia, business and civil society participated.

The Government of Turkey invited ministers and high level leaders from UN Member States and a number of international organizations to IGF. Formal invitations to the IGF were also sent to government institutions, academic institutions, businesses and civil society organizations within Turkey. To facilitate participation, a website was launched providing IGF 2014 participants with practical information about their stay in Turkey.

http://www.igf2014.org.tr

Technical facilities provided in Istanbul enabled a record number of online participants to engage in the meeting's discussions and dialogues. As a whole, IGF 2014 in Istanbul provided excellent venue not only with the facilities provided but also its atmosphere, rich history and culture.

As newly appointed Chairman of the Board of ICTA, I am very proud to say that Turkey enjoys new information and communication technologies and services as part of the country's strong and sustainable economic growth.

In achieving the goals of the Information Society, the Internet is the ultimate tool, with great potential to access people all around the world. Governments play important role in developing forward-looking ICT strategies and the promotion of Information Society. Turkey, the 18th largest economy in the world, assigns the utmost importance for development of the Internet, as it is one of the key drivers and components of economic growth. Turkey, having the role of Presidency of Group of Twenty (G20), will host G20 Antalya summit, 15-16 November 2015, just after the IGF 2015 to be held in Brazil. IGF 2015 will discuss many important issues, including the Internet economy, and provide an excellent opportunity to share best practices and experiences across many diverse topics. Building confidence and security, combating illegal activities and terrorism online, open and fair access to Internet, human rights, privacy, and increasing local contents are all very crucial issues where international cooperation plays an important role. The use of the Internet for the benefit of all people needs to be promoted further.

Expressing once again the great pleasure of hosting IGF 2014 in Turkey, we would like to reiterate our thanks to UNDESA, the IGF Secretariat, MAG members and all who contributed to the success of IGF 2014 in Istanbul. We trust that the successful outcome of IGF 2014 will be useful input for IGF 2015 and that we will have another successful IGF, not only in Brazil, but also in all future IGF host countries.

<div align="right">

Ömer Fatih Sayan, PhD
Chairman of the Board and President
of the Information and Communications Technologies Authority

</div>

4. Chair's Summary

4.1. Introduction

The ninth Internet Governance Forum (IGF) took place 2-5 September 2014 in Istanbul, Turkey. More than 2000 onsite participants from all continents representing different stakeholder groups (governments, intergovernmental organizations, 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.

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 Multi-stakeholder 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 the 2014 IGF were:

- A call for inputs from the community from the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) Chair was made to collect inputs on actions taken by stakeholders as a result of participation at the IGF. A summary document 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 can also contribute to the rolling documents on the IGF website.

- A revitalization of the format and content of the Chair's Summary to suggest intersessional 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 organizations.

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 on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) Working Group on Improvements to the Internet Governance Forum that were recognized 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 and published 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, multi-stakeholder 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 Multi-stakeholder 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 and other sessions 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 and other event organizers asked to categorize their sessions under one of the themes, to the extent possible. This process helped the MAG to ensure that the more than 100 workshops

and other sessions 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.

4.2. 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

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 multi-stakeholder 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 continued 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-fertilization 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.

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 Multi-stakeholder 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** by the deadline of 15 September 2014. 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**.

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 the IGF meetings.

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, the impact on innovation or zero-rating, there was also indeed 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 network neutrality discussion forward. The discussions had shown that the IGF, as a genuine multi-stakeholder 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.**

Human Rights

Organizers 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 recognized 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 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 access is a job 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 our goal of bringing every person on the planet broadband access to the Internet.**

Many participants said that the IGF could work on ways to best calculate those who are connected and those who are not, by bringing together experiences from all stakeholders. Another issue that was highlighted was that **broadband access should be recognized as a universal right and key to digital social inclusion**. This was considered to be especially important for those with disabilities and to promote multilingualism.

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 youth and their rights of free expression, participation and privacy.**

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 organizations. 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 multi-stakeholder discussions and decision making around issues such as Domain Name System (DNS) security and national sovereignty, data privacy and law enforcement access, intellectual property rights protection, 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.

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 competency or literacy 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 restricted.

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

4.3.   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 each of the sessions.

Statistics on Participation

- 2,403 onsite participants • 1,291 remote participants
- 60 remote hubs with an estimated 1852 participants • 144 countries represented

Onsite Participation by Region		Onsite Participation by Stakeholder Group	
Africa	190	Civil Society	779
Asia Pacific	405	Government	571
Eastern Europe	133	Intergovernmental Organizations	96
Host Country	745	Private Sector	581
Latin America and the Caribbean	150	Technical Community	266
Western Europe and Others	780	Media	110

- 135 sessions • 14 pre-events •

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

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 multi-stakeholder 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, expressing his appreciation for hosting the ninth IGF in Istanbul, 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 and 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 multi-stakeholder 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 Lütfi 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 globalization and strengthen international multi-stakeholder 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 multi-stakeholder approach, which brings together government policy makers, businesses, non-governmental organizations (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's inclusive nature makes it an ideal venue for enriching discussion on policy creation, conversations that can contribute to bringing economic and social benefits to more people around the world. The delegate emphasized that the IGF helps to improve multi-stakeholder accountability and effectiveness and is core to enhancing the security, stability, privacy, resilience and interoperability of the global Internet.

• DAY 2 •

Policies Enabling Access, Growth and Development on the Internet

The session discussed Internet economic growth from a developing country's 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 marginalized groups.

The session had a roundtable set-up and invited 22 speakers, 13 of whom were from developing countries and two from international organizations. 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 go beyond the connectivity and infrastructure issues, but also incorporated the role of social inclusion in the debate, including users with disabilities and marginalized 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 recognized 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 multi-stakeholder 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 standardizing 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 standardization 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 lifelong 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 contentious 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 Multi-stakeholder 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 indeed 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 geographically 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 issue. In the end, emphasis was put on the need to achieve a common understanding of certain concepts, while realizing that a one-sized fits all policy solution may be an inappropriate way to proceed globally. 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, there was convergence of views on the importance of enhancing users experience.

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, however 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 multi-stakeholder 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 Internet governance and turning to models they are familiar with to address concerns they have about the use and potential misuse of the Internet. Existing organizations, such as UN agencies, upon request by the governments examine their roles in relation to Internet-related issues while newer organizations 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 organizations. 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 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 recognized 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 multi-stakeholderism had to not just be a principle to follow but must also deliver results. In contrast, a different participant suggested that it would be naïve to believe that the multi-stakeholder 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 2,500 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 globalization 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 summarizing 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 localized 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 wellinformed 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 intersessional 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 "multi-stakeholder 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 multi-stakeholder 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 Multi-stakeholder Statement of Sao Paulo as issues of with the 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 to be sent to the NTIA outlining how NTIA's stewardship could be replaced by a global multi-stakeholder 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 multi-stakeholder 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 multi-stakeholder process to develop a new IANA oversight model could build further trust in the multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance.
- There was a suggestion to clarify where accountability with regards to the IANA stewardship transition and accountability with regards to 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 prioritized 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 representing all stakeholder groups reaffirmed the importance of the multi-stakeholder 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 Lütfi 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 interest and highest level of participation to 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 11th IGF Meeting in the United States of Mexico in 2016, subject to the extension of the IGF mandate. In true multi-stakeholder 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.

Announcements, Launches and Other Highlights of IGF 2014

Best Practice Forums (BPFs)

Best practice forums were held on the following topics:

- Developing Meaningful Multi-stakeholder 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 wrapup 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 forwardlooking 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.

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 organizers 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 institutionalized. Roundtable participants recognized 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 recognized 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 that maturity of the discussions at the IGF contributed to make human rights a central principle of the NETmundial Multi-stakeholder 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 intersessional 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-fertilization 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 intersessional time include:

- Create a working group on the impact of the last 10 years of IGF meetings for national/regionals 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 organizations, presidents of

regulatory bodies, leaders of 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, 'Beyond NETmundial: The Roadmap for Institutional Improvements to the Global Internet Governance Ecosystem'.[1]

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 UN General Assembly WSIS+10 review process.

---

[1]   http://www.global.asc.upenn.edu/publications/beyond-netmundial-the-roadmap-for-institu-tional-improvements-to-the-global-internet-governance-ecosystem/

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 by the deadline, 15 September 2014 at:

http://unctad.org/en/Pages/CSTD/WSIS-10yearReview.aspx

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 was 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.itu.int/en/ITU-T/accessibility/dcad/Pages/default.aspx

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

5.   Preparations for IGF 2014

5.1   IGF MAG, Open Consultations and Online Preparations

The Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) advises the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the programme and schedule of Internet Governance Forum meetings. The MAG consists of representatives from governments, the private sector, civil society and technical community. Regional and gender balance are also key considerations when appointing MAG members. The national hosts of previous IGFs are also invited to participate in MAG meetings.

The MAG for the ninth IGF was announced 10 January 2014.[1] 19 of the 55 MAG members for 2014 were new to the MAG. On 23 May 2014, United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon officially announced the appointment of Janis Karklinš of Latvia as the Chair of the 2014 MAG.[2] In keeping with the tradition of having the host country serve as honorary chair of the Open Consultations and MAG meetings, Dr. Ahmet Erding Cavusoglu, Head of International Relations of the Department for Information and Communication Technology Authority, Turkey, served as honorary chair of 2014's preparatory meetings.

5.1.1.   Summary of Preparatory Meetings

The programme for the IGF meeting in Istanbul was based on lessons learned from past years' programmes as well as the proceedings of the Open Consultations and MAG Meetings. Two sets of Open Consultations and MAG Meetings were held:

	Type of participant	No. of participants
19-20 February 2014	MAG	42 onsite
Geneva		5 remotely
	Others	77 onsite
		15 remotely
	Total participants (onsite and remote)	*139*
19-21 May 2014	MAG members	35 onsite
Paris	Others	95 onsite
	Total participants (onsite)[3]	130

In addition to the face-to-face meetings, there were seven virtual meetings of the MAG:

18 March 2014	MAG	33 (plus MAG Chair)
	Others	3 (inc. 1 previous local host)

---

[1]   http://www.un.org/press/en/2014/pi2078.doc.htm

[2]   http://www.un.org/press/en/2014/sga1471.doc.htm

[3]   No record was kept of remote participants.

1 April 2014	MAG	27 (plus MAG Chair)
	Others	6 (inc. 1 previous local host)
16 April 2014	MAG	22 (plus MAG Chair)
	Others	2 (inc. 1 previous local host)
7 May 2014	MAG	23 (plus MAG Chair)
	Others	4 (inc. 2 previous local hosts)
18 June 2014	MAG	22 (plus MAG Chair and local host)
	Others	3 (inc. previous local host)
8 July 2014	MAG	22 (plus MAG Chair)
	Others	2 (inc. previous local host)
19 August 2014	MAG	25 (plus MAG Chair and local host)
	Others	8 (inc. 2 previous local hosts)

Development of the Programme for the 2014 Meeting

The goals of the IGF programme are to:

- Maximize the opportunity for open and inclusive dialogue and the exchange of ideas.
- Create feedback loops between different types of sessions.
- Create opportunities to share good practices and experiences.
- Build capacities amongst all stakeholders.
- Enable participants—both on-site and online—to listen, learn and engage in dialogue.
- Enable the community to identify key themes that could benefit from the multi-stakeholder perspective of future IGFs.

To better achieve these goals, a number of innovations were introduced to the overall format and thematic substance of the ninth IGF programme. In particular, these innovations were driven by:

- **Feedback and recommendations from the IGF multi-stakeholder community following the eighth IGF in Bali**

    In December 2013, the IGF Secretariat put out a call for general reflections on the Bali meeting and recommendations and suggestions for the ninth IGF. The IGF Secretariat summarized the 26 contributions in a synthesis paper[4] that was used as an input to the first Open Consultations and MAG meetings, 19-20 February. Further feedback was received from the community during the two Open Consultation days that preceded the MAG meetings in February and May.

- **Recommendations of the Commission for Science and Technology Development (CSTD) Working Group on IGF improvements**

    In December 2013, in its annual resolution on ICT for Development,[5] the United Nations General Assembly requested that the United Nations Secretary-General submit, "as part of his annual reporting on the progress made in the implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information

---

[4] http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/images/2014/February/synthesis%20paper%20feb%20 2014finalv2.pdf

[5] http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/ares68d198_en.pdf

Society, information on the progress made in the implementation of the recommen-
dations contained in the report of the Working Group, particularly on enhancing
the participation of developing countries". The 2014 MAG committed to continue
implementing the Working Group's recommendations, while noting that many of
the recommendations would require increased funding to the IGF trust fund.

- **Recommendations stemming from the NETmundial, and other related Internet
  governance processes**

  The NETmundial meeting held in Sao Paulo, 23-24 April 2014, recognized the need
  for a strengthened IGF "to better serve as a platform for discussing both long stand-
  ing and emerging issues with a view to contributing to the identification of possible
  ways to address them".[6] The NETmundial outcome document also recognized the
  importance of implementing the recommendations of the CSTD Working Group
  on IGF Improvements.

The innovations made to the IGF in 2014 in Istanbul were:

- The collection and publication of community contributions documenting actions
  taken by stakeholders—since the first IGF in Athens—as a result of participation
  at the IGF.
- Five Best Practice Forums.
- The inclusion of suggested inter-sessional work modalities in the Chair's Summary
  of the meeting.
- Using the meeting's sub-themes to categorize workshops and other events in the pro-
  gramme and not be the basis for organizing the main sessions of the meeting.
- Include highly topical sessions as main/focus sessions: network neutrality, the evolu-
  tion of the Internet Governance ecosystem, and IANA functions.
- Greater emphasis on recording outcomes from the meeting, including statements and
  recommendations that were developed by workshops and pre-events.

The sub-themes for IGF 2014 were agreed by consensus at the February MAG meeting:

- 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

Following discussion by the MAG, working closely with IGF stakeholders and the host
country, the Chair announced at the end of February that the overarching theme for the
2014 IGF was:

Connecting Continents for Enhanced Multi-stakeholder Internet Governance[7]

---

[6]   http://netmundial.br/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/NETmundial-Multi-stakeholder-Docu-
      ment.pdf

[7]   http://mail.intgovforum.org/pipermail/igfmaglist_intgovforum.org/2014-February/001079.html

Time	Day 0 1 September	Day 1 2 September	Day 2 3 September	Day 3 4 September	Day 4 5 September
09:30–12:30	Pre-Events	Orientation Session Setting the Scene: Topical Insight and Debate Related to the Subthemes of IGF 2014	Policies Enabling Access, Growth and Development on the Internet	Evolution of the Internet Governance Ecosystem and the Role of IGF	IANA Functions: NTIA's Stewardship Transition and ICANN's Accountability Process Taking Stock
12:30–14:30	LUNCH BREAK				
14:30–17:30	Pre-Events + High Level Leaders Meeting (14:00-18:00)	Opening Ceremony/ Opening Session	Network Neutrality: Towards a Common Understanding of a Complex Issue	Best Practices Forums Wrap-Up (14:30-16:00)	Open Microphone Session Closing Ceremony

The IGF 2014 program consisted of many different types of sessions:

1. **Pre-events**

   As per IGF tradition, space was made available on "Day 0" to organizations and groups wishing to co-locate their meetings with IGF. The pre-events included a multi-stakeholder High Level Leaders Meeting organized by Turkey.

2. **Main/focus sessions**

   Each of the main /focus sessions was designed to be an opportunity for a productive exchange between all stakeholders on policy approaches, challenges and practical options to address them. The goal of main/focus sessions is to discuss practices or issues and their relevance to all stakeholders. The rest of the IGF programme was designed to enable "feeder" sessions to take place before main sessions on the same topic. All main sessions/focus sessions were accompanied by a live transcription in English and interpretation in all six UN languages. The transcription was streamed in real time online. All main /focus sessions were webcast. A table displaying the main/focus sessions of the meeting is included at the end of this list.

3. **Workshops**

   Workshops were selected for inclusion based on a range of criteria including the completeness of the respective proposals, their diversity in all aspects and their willingness to merge, if and when they were asked. More than 200 full workshop proposals were received and evaluated by the MAG. Workshops were accepted based on their evaluations and qualitative scoring conducted by the MAG together with further analysis and selection which strived to provide space for workshops from developing and transitional economy countries and first time workshop organizers and newcomers to the IGF. Workshops that focused on new and emerging topics were also given some priority to ensure that the IGF will cover as many issues as possible. Accepted workshops and other sessions were coached and guided by the MAG, where necessary, to build upon their proposals to ensure rich and relevant sessions are held in Istanbul. All workshop organizers were requested to provide background papers prior to their sessions and were invited to produce substantive analysis papers after the workshops.

4. **Open forums**

   Governments and organizations dealing with Internet governance related issues were given a workshop slot, at their request, to hold an open forum to present and discuss their activities. Each open forum focused on the organization's activities during the past year and allowed time for questions and discussions. All open forum organizers were requested to provide background papers prior to their sessions and a report of their session.

5. **Dynamic Coalitions**

   Dynamic Coalitions were provided with space to hold action-oriented sessions to further develop their activities. Dynamic Coalitions were asked to make an effort to ensure that a broad range of stakeholders could bring their expertise to the discussions and to present a report on their achievements so far and, in particular, on their activities in 2013/2014 and their meeting in Bali (if one was held).

6. **Best Practice Forums**

   Best Practice Forums were one of the innovations at IGF 2014. The aim of the sessions during the meeting were to provide a space to discuss what constitutes a "best practice",

share relevant information and experiences, build consensus around best practices that could be transferred to other situations, and strengthen capacity building activities.

7. **Flash sessions**

   A flash session provided presenters/organizers with a space to evoke/spark the interest of the participants in specific reports, case studies, best practices, methodologies, or tools that have been implemented in particular contexts or are in the process of implementation. Flash sessions were shorter in duration than other types of IGF sessions.

Providing an enabling environment for enhanced participation in the IGF 2014 programme

IGF 2014 continued to use the following mechanisms that have proved very successful in past IGFs:

1. **Online participation tools**

   As in past meetings, online participation[8] was a key consideration in developing the programme for IGF 2014. All sessions were encouraged to nominate a moderator to facilitate interaction between online and onsite participants. The IGF Secretariat, in cooperation with the Remote Participation Working Group, provided training sessions for remote moderators in the months leading up to the Istanbul meeting. Online participation was available through webcasts, live transcripts and Webex rooms. In addition, participants were encouraged to use the hashtag #IGF2014 when using social media to discuss topics under discussion at the meeting.

2. **Remote hubs**

   Remote hubs have greatly contributed to the continued success of the IGF. There was greater attention paid at IGF 2014 to including hubs as part of the overall IGF meeting.

3. **Guiding principles**

   Over the years, IGF has developed a number of principles to support the active and constructive engagement of participants and to comply with United Nations guidelines. Below is a selection of the principles. The full list can be found in the Programme for the 2014 Meeting.[9]

   - Prepared statements were strongly discouraged during the main sessions, except for the opening and closing ceremonies.
   - Delegates were encouraged to refrain from making ad hominem attacks towards individual persons, companies, countries or entities during their interventions and throughout the general discussions and debates in main sessions, workshops and other events at IGF meetings.
   - All organizations holding official events (workshops, best practices etc.) were asked to submitting a report on their event. Non-submission of a report disqualifies organizations from holding an event at the next IGF.
   - Only Dynamic Coalitions that have submitted activity reports or meeting reports were included in the schedule.

---

[8]   It should be noted that the term "online participation" rather than "remote participation" is a more accurate reflection of the fact that, as well as remote participants, many onsite participants choose to use IGF's online participation tools to provide a better experience of the meetings.

[9]   http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2014/programme

- Documents distributed at the meeting were requested to follow UN guidelines on suitability, not be blatantly inflammatory or potentially libellous and the actions and arguments to be criticized based on their merits and not their source. Ad hominem attacks were also discouraged.
- Commercial logos, flags, banners or printed publications were not permitted in the main meeting halls.

4. **List of resource persons**

To assist workshop and session organizers identify potential speakers, panelists, chairs or moderators, IGF maintains a database of resource persons. People interested in being available in such capacities were invited to register their names and details with the IGF Secretariat.

5. **Accessibility of the venue**

Part of the agreement with the local host was to ensure that the IGF 2014 venue was accessible for people with disabilities.

Best Practice Forums

The Best Practice Forums were the first experiment in substantial inter-sessional work between annual IGF meetings. Best Practice Forums were first proposed during the collection of feedback about IGF 2013 and ideas for IGF 2014.[10] It was noted that the IGF had tried to promote best practices sessions and organized Best Practice Forums in the past, but due to to lack of resources, the outcomes of these sessions were not documented sufficiently. At the February Open Consultations and MAG meetings, there was general support for the idea of holding better-resourced Best Practice Forums at IGF 2014. Discussion continued online after the February meeting. 22 of the MAG's 55 members responded to a mini-survey in April 2014, resulted in three top three contenders for Best Practice Forum topics: Internet Governance Principles, Regional and National IGFs, and Cybersecurity.[11] However, following further discussion online and at the May MAG meeting, it was decided to hold Best Practice Forums on the following five topics.

Developing meaningful multi-stakeholder mechanisms;

- Regulation and mitigation of unwanted communications (e.g. "spam");
- Establishing and supporting Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRTs) for Internet security;
- Creating an enabling environment for the development of local content;
- Online child protection.

Lead experts were then assigned to each of the Best Practice Forums, with the inter-sessional work beginning in earnest in June 2014. A mailing list and online community platform was created for each Best Practice Forum.[12] The lead experts managed the email lists and

---

[10] http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/images/2014/February/synthesis%20paper%20feb%20 2014finalv2.pdf

[11] http://mail.intgovforum.org/pipermail/igfmaglist_intgovforum.org/2014-April/001293.html

[12] For example, see http://mail.intgovforum.org/mailman/listinfo/bp_multi-stakeholder_intgovforum.org and http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/community/groups/viewgroup/22-developing-meaningful-multi-stakeholder-participation-mechanisms

led global discussions on each of the topics. The lead experts were supported by the IGF Secretariat, which recruited two additional experts to document the outcomes of the discussion. In late August 2014, a mere eight weeks after the discussion had begun, each group published an initial draft of Best Practices. An open call for public comments on the five draft Best Practice documents was made on 22 August, with an initial deadline of the last day of the IGF meeting in Istanbul: 5 September 2014. The deadline was later extended to 15 September. The discussions and resulting draft documents were fed into five 90-minute forums during the IGF 2014 meeting in Istanbul, which, in turn, reported into a Best Practice Forums Wrap Up Main Session. The **final outcome documents** of the five Best Practice Forums were published at the end of November 2014 and are included in Part 2 of this book.

6.   A Summary of Discussions in Istanbul

The Chair's summary of the meeting, reproduced in Section 3 of this book, presented a more detailed overview of sessions and outcomes in the past. This section, therefore, concentrates mainly on the conclusions and recommendations on the way forward that came out of the meeting's main sessions, workshops and other sessions.

6.1.   Summary of Discussions Grouped by Sub-Theme

Below are summaries of discussions that took place both in main sessions dedicated to IGF 2014's sub-themes as well as in workshops, flash sessions, and other sessions in the programme.

6.1.1.   Policies Enabling Access, Growth and Development on the Internet

This section covers three sub-themes of the IGF 2014 as the three sub-themes were combined into a single main session due to the inter-related nature of access, development and content creation and use:

- Policies Enabling Access
- Content Creation, Dissemination and Use
- Internet as an Engine for Growth and Development

Highlights of topics discussed

- The digital divide
- The role of broadband in enabling access
- Social barriers to access (including disability, marginalized groups, women, youth)
- Public policies to encourage access
- How different stakeholders can work together to improve access
- Cybersecurity and its role in encouraging people to feel safe enough to go online
- Respect for network neutrality and human rights as tools for enabling greater access
- The role of education and skills in enabling people to use the Internet as a tool for development
- Sharing best practices to build capacity

Sessions that covered these sub-themes at IGF 2014

1. **Main Session: Policies Enabling Access, Growth and Development on the Internet**

Going into Istanbul, the following questions were developed for discussion in the main session:

1. What are the national regulatory best practices driving Internet access—relevant to the 4 billion unconnected citizens of the world? Will, what got us here, get us there?

2. Can intergovernmental and multilateral agencies, developed country governments through bi-laterals, and private entities, help hasten Internet access, linking it to development in emerging economies? Or is access almost entirely a national public policy challenge for developing countries?

3. Are countries with high Internet penetration and lower cost of access, approaching the challenge in terms of regulatory intervention, legislation, investment environment, technology options and multi-stakeholder participation in decision-making, differently? How are countries with small populations spread over great distances responding to the challenge?

4. Are norms linking Internet penetration to GDP growth, per capita income, poverty eradication, education, rate of employment, etc., universally acceptable? Can Internet linked economic and social development norms work as peer pressure amongst emerging economies?

5. Most developing country governments have announced national broadband plans. Who is funding National Broadband Plans? What is the state of their implementation and will they need revision during the next 2-3 years on account of emerging technologies? Can lack of local content becoming a barrier to meaningful access and use of Internet?

6. How important are public access policies in ensuring widespread access to the unconnected, especially as it relates to responsibilities of actors regarding human rights and disadvantaged groups in Information Society? How to ensure a continued focus on areas that need special attention?

7. What role can the IGF play to become a catalyst, to enhance its knowledge agenda through global dialogue amongst multi-stakeholder groups to record learnings, improve information sharing, and strengthen best practices in access/development? Suggest specific steps as inputs for the MAG 2015.

Workshops:

There were a total of 32 workshops associated with the three sub-themes related to access, content and development.

Content Creation, Dissemination and Use:

1. WS11: Languages on the Move: Deploying multilingualism in the Net
2. WS18: The Business of Creativity: User Generated Content and IP
3. WS66: Content4D: Diversifying the Global Content and Apps Market
4. WS93: One World, Diverse Content and Flexible Access
5. WS94: Creating, Protecting and Providing Access to Digital Culture
6. WS201: Building Local Content Creation Capacity: Lessons Learned

Internet as an Engine for Growth and Development:

1. WS3: Cloud Computing and M2M: Impacts for Emerging Economies
2. WS7: From Ideas to Solutions: Funding Challenges for Internet Dev
3. WS10: New Global Visions for Internet Governance, ICTs and Trade
4. WS15: Empowerment Displaced People Through Online Education svc.
5. WS22: Clouds and Mobile Internet: Benefiting Developing Countries

6. WS30: Internet and Jobs: Creative Destruction or Destructive creation?
7. WS65: The Role of IXPs in Growing the Local Digital Economy
8. WS68: Small Island Developing States (SIDS) Roundtable: The Information Society vs Basic Infrastructural Needs
9. WS89: Multi-Stakeholder Engagement: Imperative for Accessibility
10. WS136: Internet as an Engine of Growth and Development
11. WS159: Global Public Interest of the Internet
12. WS171: Connecting Small Island States With Access To Data
13. WS194: New Economics for the New Networked World
14. WS198: Social and Economic Justice Issues in Global IG
15. WS206: An Evidence-Based Intermediary Liability Policy Framework

Policies Enabling Access:

1. WS41: Policy to Promote Broadband Access in Developing Countries
2. WS51: Connecting the Continents Through Fibre Pptic
3. WS70: Open Data and Data Publishing Governance in Big Data Age
4. WS74: Enabling Affordable Access: Changing Role of the Regulator
5. WS99: Digital Inclusion Policies for the Forgotten Billion
6. WS163: Building alliances to Enhance Internet Affordability
7. WS169: Technologies and Policies to Connect the Next Five Billion
8. WS172: Network Neutrality: a Roadmap for Infrastructure Enhancement
9. WS195: The Internet Age: Adapting to a New Copyright Agenda
10. WS208: Net Neutrality, Zero-Rating and Development: What's the Data?
11. WS225: Online Freedoms and Access to Information Online

Areas where consensus is emerging

There was emerging consensus that discussions about enabling access should not focus on improving physical infrastructure and connectivity, but also address the effect **social inclusion** can have on the ability for marginalized groups, such as women and people with disabilities, to gain access to the Internet and its services.

Related to the issue of removing social barriers to access, it was generally agreed that **broadband access should be recognized as a universal right** and key to enabling digital social inclusion.

The importance of **multilingualism and localized content** were widely recognized as key factors in driving Internet adoption more widely.

Capacity building, as well as education in its many forms—including formal school systems and broader digital and media literacy—were understood to be key factors in encouraging greater Internet use and development.

It was also agreed that **widening participation in the multi-stakeholder model** of Internet governance to include a broader range of stakeholders would help raise awareness of the benefits and challenges of providing Internet access, and that wider participation would

also help enable innovative solutions to overcome challenges to access. For example, it was suggested that the participation of small enterprises and local communities would lead to ongoing Internet development opportunities.

Sharing lessons learned and best practices are practical ways that stakeholders around the world can cooperate and work together to bring access to all.

High Internet connection prices can be a significant barrier to access and there should be efforts to help **make the Internet more affordable**, and therefore accessible, to more people everywhere.

Areas of ongoing debate

While there was general agreement that governments have an important role to play in developing Internet infrastructure, there was no consensus on **the exact role governments should play** in implementing public access policies.

Some strongly felt that **broadband access should be recognized as a universal right**, but this was not agreed to by all.

Comparison of discussion at IGF 2015 with previous IGF discussions

Access has been a key sub-theme at IGF since 2006. Since 2006, there has been a trend to recognize that access is not only predicated on physical access to the Internet, but also social factors that can prevent or discourage people from connecting.

The role that ICTs and the Internet have played in working to achieve the MDGs was a key focus of the IGF 2013 session, "Internet as an Engine for Growth and Sustainable Development", and also resulted in general consensus that the role of ICTs and the Internet needed to be strengthened in the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, to be adopted in late 2015.

Documents or actions that came out of the discussions

The Dynamic Coalition on Accessibility and Disability produced the living document, *DCAD Accessibility Guidelines 2014: Accessibility and Disability in IGF Meetings*:

http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/dynamic-coalitions/dynamic-coalition-on-accessibility-and-disability/258-igf-2014-dcad-accessibility-guidelines-final-v5/file

Community suggestions and recommendations on ways forward

In the main session, there were suggestions to:

- **Increase the emphasis on ICTs and Internet access in the post-2015 development agenda of the UN**, as catalysts for economic growth.
- **Focus the work of community on how to connect the next four billion people** in the lead-up to IGF 2015.
- **Examine ways to standardise methodologies at an international level to calculate access levels** across a number of different national standards with the aim of enabling more informed discussion on access in future.
- Have future IGFs **examine the effectiveness of national broadband plans** in delivering access to un- or under-connected communities and discuss how to ensure that broadband lives up to its full potential.

Below are the conclusions and suggestions that were developed by workshops on the sub-themes of access, content, and development:

Workshops on Content Creation, Dissemination and Use

WS11: Content Creation, Dissemination and Use

Although there are mixed feelings around the possible further uptake of IDNs in the near future, there is a general belief that the IDNs will emerge in the long term, especially considering the next billion end users that should access the Net in the next decade. Therefore, all participants agreed that IDNs are still the best way to make the Internet a truly multi-lingual environment.

Reported by: Giovanni Seppia, EURid

WS18: The Business of Creativity: User Generated Content and IP

- Clearer and easier-to-apply solutions to some of the issues occurring in the creation, distribution and access of UGC could be found. Notably in the areas of cross-border uses of content, remuneration of different players in the value chain, originality requirement and defenses for re-uses. Proposed solutions include: development of uniform interoperable metadata; new licensing schemes and agreements by stakeholders; changes in copyright legislation focused on clarifying grey areas. Legislative solutions would need to be balanced and neutral to technology and business models.

- Social media platforms reduce barriers to content creation. However, there is a need to develop ways for individual creators to successfully monetize their content through social media platforms in ways other than advertising.

- We should continue to explore and scale technical solutions such as the attachment of metadata to content and the establishment of technical standards organizations, allowing for easier content discovery and delivery.

- A fair and well-functioning approach to UGC is an asset for users, platforms and copyright-holders; both in the developed and developing world.

- Given the fast changes occurring in this area, there is a need to keep monitoring the situation and continue the discussion, among all stakeholders, on how to improve practices, technological standards and regulation.

Reported by: Janine Khraishah, WEF

WS66: Content4D: Diversifying the global content and apps market

- Stimulating the demand side and the development of applications is key to fully benefit from the Internet economy.

- There is a need to develop applications especially for the base of the pyramid Success factors for the development of local content and applications include:
  - basic literacy
  - the development of an ICT skilled labour force and talent as well as the development of media, information and digital literacy skills
  - the promotion of entrepreneurship and increasing the number of apps developers
  - app distribution platforms that do not rely on credit cards and bank accounts
  - the provision of effective financial mechanisms, and the

- ° availability of electricity, good connectivity and spectrum
- ° More competition between different app platforms could benefit app developers in emerging countries.
- ° An open Internet is key for the further development of local content and applications and policy makers should refrain from over-regulating the Internet.

Reported by: Verena Weber, Colombian Telecommunications Regulator

WS93: One World, Diverse Content and Flexible Access

1. Conclusions for the preservation of cultural and linguistic diversity:

   - Supporting multilingual education and promoting the use of mother tongue are essential in multicultural societies.
   - Establishing virtual knowledge networks across continents to share information and data and knowledge, taking into account cultural and linguistic diversity.
   - Supporting and strengthening global collaborative projects, and the need for community participation to be empowered through simple tools.

2. Conclusions for the governmental policies required to enhance the creation and dissemination of local content:

   - Lowering the cost of digital technology, along with the reduction of Internet access costs.
   - Safeguarding linguistic diversity, particularly endangered and lesser-used languages by exploring all technological solutions and innovative platforms.
   - Formulating policies and strategies for the development of digital content at the sectorial, national and regional levels.
   - Encouraging investments to support entrepreneurs, start-ups and SMEs operating in the digital content industry.
   - Governments should work on making public sector information widely accessible in digital format so it can be easily used, re-used, combined and shared.

Reported by: Raymond Maher Kamel,
Ministry of Communications and Information Technology, Egypt

WS94: Creating, protecting and providing access to digital culture

1. There is a broad agreement on the need for limitations and exceptions for libraries and archives, enabling them to perform their fundamental services in the digital environment; however governments are not ready to agree on which is the right way to achieve this goal at the international level.

2. Technology plays a crucial role in this debate. Lack of interoperability is considered a problem by most stakeholders.

3. Cross border uses and digital preservation are the major issues in the born-digital material debate.

4. Debate on the creation, preservation, distribution and access to born-digital content touches upon a number of public interests, vested by many stakeholders. Yet when considering the needs of cultural institutions charged with preserving the historical and cultural record, all parties should strive to avoid conflation of these issues with

ongoing discussions regarding the illegal sharing of digital content. The topic shall remain in the agenda of future initiatives.

Reported by: Stuart Hamilton,
International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions

WS201: Building Local Content Creation Capacity: Lessons Learned

Ideas that emerged as potential follow up from the session:

Create opportunities for emerging content creators to learn from each other's experiences.

- Strive to bring problem solving and creative arts into all levels of education. Universities, governments and industry could explore ways to bridge skill gaps with innovations centers and hubs, and tailor post-secondary education curricula to areas that support content creation. These centers could also address access for people with disabilities and research information regarding local markets.
- Policy makers should make sure they have effective intellectual property frameworks and education of content developers on how they work
- Encourage and allow development of new business models that will help creators to find a market and create a sustainable revenue stream.
- Continue to focus on core needs like increasing connectivity and encourage investment in infrastructure.

Reported by: Anonymous

Workshops on Internet as an Engine for Growth and Development

WS3 Cloud Computing and M2M: Impacts for Emerging Economies

Filipe Araujo:

- Governments must take the right measures to make use of the cloud and M2M data. Technology helps us to define policies on an evidence base, and cities can assist this process in the future.
- Privacy and security should be placed as priorities, as mismanagement of these concerns can cancel out everything that has been done before.

Rudolph Van Der Berg:

- Governments should change the regulation that limits ownership of public networks. If they would allow private virtual networks as well, we would see a massive boost.
- Strong infrastructure will increase the number of people hosting websites in a country. If we do not strengthen infrastructure, the Internet will find another place to go.

Dr. Noha Adly:

- Policymakers need to have metrics and criteria in order to create the framework for measuring the impact and the assessment for the cloud computing.
- Governments must include all stakeholders in the activities relating to the strategy and execution of cloud systems.

Verena Weber:

- We may wish to differentiate types of data that are of particular in importance, in order to design specific solutions for the transfer of each type of data. It is important to fight poverty and deploy the technology for the people.

Dr. Rohan Samarajiva:

- Emerging economies should improve their infrastructure to support small and medium enterprises that will eventually create the jobs, and enhance economic growth. Attention should be paid to how consumers and small businesses actually experience the Internet they purchase.

Reported by: Sophie Tomlinson, ICC-BASIS

WS7: From ideas to Solutions: Funding Challenges for Internet Dev

- Documentation to share lessons learned and build the case for financial support is key to the development of the Internet.

- To have a variety of funding alternatives available for a variety of organizations of different sizes and capacities is key to guarantee a diverse and vibrant environment.

- Collaboration among practitioners but as well among donors and investors to overcome limitations and restrictions and to share risk is a vital point of the current status: no one can do it alone.

- Investment in capacity building (not only on technical issues but for business development) and Internet access solutions are still very relevant, as is inclusion and rights. There are still many to be connected and to make strategic use of the Internet they require not only access and a strategy about what to do with what they have learned, but the capacity to maintain it to allow others to benefit.

Reported by: Sylvia Cadena, APNIC

WS10: New Global Visions for Internet Governance, ICTs and Trade

Engagement:

- It is vital to keep companies from all sectors engaged and active in the Internet governance debate. Traditional operations (such as retail) receive 75% of the economic benefits attributed to the Internet, not technology companies. Thus, all stakeholders need to be at the negotiating table in order to have a truly consultative and legitimate process. Engagement could begin with the participation of primary players in the global supply chain such as: banks, energy, healthcare.

- Business needs to recognize the need to be more present in trade negotiations. They need to push for negotiations that advance and promote the Internet globally.

Innovation Policies:

- It is essential that disruptions associated with the Internet are addressed. The digital economy is destroying a lot of jobs, so it is critical that people who are displaced in this new era are retrained with skills valuable in the new age. This can be achieved by fostering and creating innovation ecosystems that look to strengthen IT skills of a population, create ecosystems at the local level and provide private sector leadership.

- Policies should be developed which encourage people to jump into new electronic means. A first step in this process could be bringing more small businesses into the formal economy through e-type payments.

Trust:

- Trust issues are a major hindrance to the further globalization of the Internet. Data localization policies have the potential to bring about trade disputes and hold up

trade negotiations, so it is important that all sectors work together to find positions that offer a significant level of data protection while also liberalizing trade policy.

Societal Benefits:

- The Internet serves as a gender enabler, as men and women are equally helped by the Internet. Internet policies should focus on maintaining this environment through representation from all stakeholder groups.

Cross-Border Data Flows:

- Governments and business should work to create partnerships on privacy/data protection that guarantee a baseline level of protection without adding additional regulatory burdens and increased costs. Efforts similar to the work on interoperability between APEC's Cross Border Privacy Rules and the EU's Corporate Binding Rules might be a good place to start.

Reported by: Jessica Jones, BT America

WS15: Empowerment of Displaced People Through Online Education svc.

As the conclusions from the workshop, it was proposed to collect best practices in the area of education, especially for displaced people, refugees and migrants. Participants also agreed that the role of local authority is very important for the implementation of the ICT strategies for the development and implementation of educational tools and online education programmes. Educational services and courses are major part of the empowerment of displaced people as they help them to adapt under new conditions and most of the people became displaced because they wanted to protect their children which means that children were out of schools and universities.

Speakers answered questions and agreed that in terms of the financial part, there should be multi-stakeholder approach and actually students (users of those services) should also contribute which mean they would value what they get. For the displaced people case there should be international organization which should finance their educational activities. In terms of content control and quality measurement it was proposed to continue integration with traditional accreditation system for the content control and quality measurement. There is also need of capacity building and educational initiatives in the field of safe and responsible use of the ICTs for migrants and displaced people. Multi-stakeholder dialogue on the topic of empowerment displaced people through educational services should be continued at the next IGF.

Reported by: Dr. Mikhail Komarov,
National Research University Higher School of Economics

WS22: Clouds and Mobile Internet: Benefiting Developing Countries

It is necessary for all of us to promote new emerging technology like cloud computing and mobile Internet to connect societies and communities, because the "disconnectivity" is the most important challenge for gaining sustainable growth and development. Mobile Internet is highly depended for eliminating "disconnectivity." Sharing data across industries and society fields is also important, because isolated information cannot be turned into value and will not benefit society.

Cooperation among multi-stakeholders will be the right direction and solution to the challenge and difficulty faced by cloud computing and mobile Internet. It is not only the solution for tackling the issues on IT infrastructure development in developing countries, but

also the practical strategy to make cloud and mobile Internet contribute more efficiently in promoting sustainable growth and development.

1. Public-Private Partnership has been a successful mode for cooperation.
2. As for international cooperation, letting the local level lead is the principle, since the local level can more precisely identify problems, which is essential.

Leveraging cloud computing service and its benefits will be helpful to bridge the digital divide both in developing countries and developed countries. The national strategy for cloud computing, Mobile Internet has become the trend and has been launched in many countries.

Reported by: Jing Ma, China Association for Science and Technology

WS30: Internet and Jobs: Creative Destruction or Destructive Creation?

Overall, there was strong agreement on the importance of discussing and thinking outside the box the relationship between Internet and jobs. Each stakeholder should play an important role in this process.

The major conclusions that came out of the workshop were:

- ICT remains the bright spot in a gloomy economy. Internet has an enormous potential as platform for new jobs creation, for industry innovation and entrepreneurship.
- Role of Small enterprises: according to the OECD studies, all the net job acquisitions come from small enterprises. Therefore, Internet is playing a particular role in this context.
- ICT and development: use ICTs to fight poverty is still an open challenge.
- ICT and education: the changes in the job market previously described require new skills that allow working alongside with the smart new machines. For this reason, government should help this job market transition with an unprecedented effort in reforming and investing in education systems. Against this backdrop, ICTs can offer tremendous upside potential for improvements in education, allowing for increasing significantly scale and customization of actions. The Massive Open Online Courses (MOCC) is a case in point.
- ICT skills are important, although cannot be seen as a panacea to solve the job crisis.
- Measurement issues: how to capture in the statistics the bounty of the digital economy; how statistics reflect the increasing role of the shared economy, increased consumer surplus, services at zero price (Wikipedia, what 'sup) that do not go into the GDP but improve customers wellbeing?
- Active adjustment labor policies and taxation: there is a strong need for government's active adjustment labor policies that require significant resources. Therefore, the issue of taxation in the digital economy becomes particularly relevant. Many large companies in the digital economy avoid the country of origin taxation through ad hoc mechanisms. Therefore, addressing base erosion and profit shifting should become a key priority of governments around the globe.
- Future jobs: the Largest opportunities should come from:
  - Managing today's grand challenges : climate change, aging population, development in a broader sense
  - Increasing leisure time and reducing the size of the work week. There has been a great job growth in leisure time-related activities.

- Take responsibility: the disruptive nature of Internet on the job market should be recognized and assessed carefully. Therefore, the Internet economy companies should recommend and finance governmental actions to reduce the effects of these processes. The private sector should also do something directly in the most disadvantaged areas of the world (cities and/or countries). Particular attention should be devoted to the effects of technology on older workers. Overall, it is necessary to keep in mind that these processes are just at the beginning, are not going away and can become worse.

Reported by: Lorenzo Pupillo, Telecom Italia

WS68: Small Island Developing States (SIDS) Roundtable: The Information Society vs Basic Infrastructural Needs

1. While there is recognition that ICT, and Internet technologies, in particular can solve larger social and infrastructural problems, ICT is at the stage where it is simply policy- and strategy-based—and often "left on a shelf" while the more "tangible" infrastructural initiatives get the attention and funding both from governments and international donors. In addition to focusing on the big, national projects (national strategies etc.), there should be similar focus on smaller, community-based, more feasible and likely impactful technology initiatives by governments and donors with a view to making ICT interventions more meaningful for the majority.

2. Partnerships and synergies across the SIDS are important—International developmental agencies could perhaps examine expanding regional projects beyond the region (from the Pacific to the Caribbean, for example) to promote collaboration, sustainability, sharing of resources and capacity with a view to contextual solutions to shared problems—as opposed to leaving the follow-up actions to each small island to attempt to solve on its own (with a likely lack of resources and capacity).

3. Policy recommendations that would facilitate the creation of neutral community networks with interconnection to public networks. These networks can be wireless, broadband networks, built on open technology and a source of open data—an area of focus which is currently in its infancy in the SIDS.

Reported by: Tracy Hackshaw, Internet Society Trinidad and Tobago Chapter

WS89: Multi-Stakeholder Engagement: Imperative for Accessibility

A multi-stakeholder approach to policy making is crucial in order to ensure that ICTs become more accessible for persons with disabilities and for society at large. Particularly, the consultation and involvement of persons with disabilities in processes is fundamental to understand the needs of persons with disabilities. The multi-stakeholder engagement approach insures that persons with disabilities are included and will be able to participate in society as full citizens. For the future, it is important to open up this discussion to other stakeholder groups and bring in a more diverse audience.

Reported by: Mischa Liatowitsch

WS159: Global Public Interest of the Internet

Participants requested that social responsibility programmes be more collaborative, and embedded in other programmes with regional or international organizations. Additionally, financing should not be considered a limitation when catering to important initiatives in the name of the public interest. With diversified high-level partnerships with external

organizations and governments, the risk and cost of deliverables should be shared between various organizations in the Internet governance ecosystem.

<div align="right">Reported by: ICANN</div>

WS171: Connecting Small Island States With Access To Data

From the debate it can been concluded that the data that results from Internet access and mobile connectivity can aid better policy and programmes, to help SIDS improve Internet governance, cybersecurity and resiliency in their countries.

The data and access to information and technology, which the Internet facilitates, can help to support the development of a rich technological ecosystem for SIDS, which connects them with continents and the world.

<div align="right">Reported by: Cintra Sooknanan, Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group TTNIC</div>

WS194: New Economics for the New Networked World

It seems that companies are going to sit very much on the numbers that are of use for the OECD and governments for measuring and understanding national economies. There may therefore be a need for more public private partnerships around in how to share the numbers. Such partnerships will need to address situations where companies offer successful services because the comparable public service has low quality. Companies may then be reluctant to share data with governments because improved public services may hurt their business. There may be a power struggle around data resources. Maybe we can measure directly if people are happy or sad by looking at their dialogue because all the words are out there. Language analysis may become more important in comparison to numeric metrics.

<div align="right">Reported by: David Nordfors, IIIJ</div>

WS206: An Evidence-Based Intermediary Liability Policy Framework

The workshop presented evidence of a variety of approaches and issues that arise out of those approaches to intermediary liability. Two choices emerged towards developing frameworks for enforcing responsibility on intermediaries. We either rely more on a traditional, essentially court-based and off-line mechanisms for regulating behaviour and disputes. The downside of this is it will be costly and costly to the public purse. It will tend to be slow, and in particular, we will lose a great deal of opportunity to extend regulation much more deeply into people's lives so as to implement the public interest. Alternatively, we could rely on intermediaries to develop and automate systems to control our behaviour. This approach does not have efficiency problems of the previous approach but does have other problems, both in terms of hindering the developments of the Information Society and potentially yielding up many of the things that we have traditionally expected as the protections of a free and liberal society. The right approach lies somewhere in the middle and development of International Principles for Intermediary Liability, announced at the end of the workshop, is a step closer to developing a balanced framework for liability.

<div align="right">Reported by: Anonymous</div>

Workshops on Policies Enabling Access

WS51: Connecting the Continents Through Fibre Optic

In the final part of the session, panelists shared a number of recommendations, which may be helpful for making effective policies for investing in fibre optic. More public-private part-

nership in fibre optic deployment was proposed which means governments are expected to work closely in a partnership with private sector in a task force for more efficient solutions. An active involvement of private sector would be also beneficial to customers in terms of decreasing access costs. What was emphasized was the importance of safe and accountable model in fibre optic development, which includes measurements and evaluation.

Reported by: Fedor Smirnov

WS70: Open Data and Data Publishing Governance in Big Data Age

Data has become an indispensable strategic resource to support scientific research and various application services. Data to information and to knowledge require theories and techniques from many fields, and the networking is the important driving force for advancements of science and technology.

Big data for scientific research requires not only advancements on innovative technologies, like data modelling, storage, intelligent analysis, and parallel computin, but also governance issues, like data policy, unified logical framework and standards, validation network, big data security, intellectual property protection, etc.

In this big data age, we have to encourage open data and data publishing governance across society, which implies access to and the reuse of data to maximize economic and social value of data through various scientific and commercial applications and education.

The data sharing on publicly funded research benefits all. It will bridge the digital divide from the efforts of all stakeholders. International organizations should continue to play the leading role in data sharing worldwide and work with other stakeholders to enhance data sharing in developing countries.

Possible follow-up actions:

- Building a cooperative international expert team to keep continuous monitoring on open data issues.
- Cooperating worldwide with stakeholders from different regions.
- Promoting best practices and cases of open data application.
- Organizing international workshops concerning the challenges and needs from countries and regions.
- Enhancing capacity building through training program and academic exchanging.
- Refining data sharing principles and guidelines.

Reported by: Ma Jing, Chinese Association for Science and Technology

WS99: Digital Inclusion Policies for the Forgotten Billion

Follow-up actions include:

- Contact with IGF Secretariat to discuss a MAG seat for a disability representative.
- Raising the suggestion of support for disability representatives and capacity training by the newly-formed IGF Support Association.
- Continuing the dialogue with ISOC on disability inclusion.
- Continuing the dialogue with ICANN on accessibility actions.

Reported by: Gunela Astbrink, ISOC Australia

WS163: Building Alliances to Enhance Internet Affordability

1. National broadband plans and strategies are critical for the expansion of broadband access.
2. Corruption is often a factor in the telecom sectors of many countries and can hinder progress.
3. Political champions that supports reform is key to getting the right policies and regulations in place.

Reported by: Emilie Yam, Alliance for Affordable Internet

WS169: Technologies and Policies to Connect the Next Five Billion

- Widespread agreement that the access network portion of the broadband ecosystem is a significant barrier to wider adoption of the Internet due to lack of low cost technology solutions and/or regulatory barriers.
- To develop more useful policy guidelines or best practices, more structured discussion of specific case studies of successful deployments in difficult economic conditions is required.
- Recommend IGF takes steps to create a forum by which these case studies can be carefully reviewed and discussed, from which a general set of best practices could be identified, documented, and distributed to the greater IGF community.
- Need for more specific successful examples of technology deployment and policy reform

Reported by: David Reed, University of Colorado

WS172: Network Neutrality: a Roadmap for Infrastructure Enhancement

- Traffic management can interfere with the freedom of expression and the right to access to information of individuals. Such interferences should be legal, proportionate to their goal and pursue a legitimate aim.
- Internet users' rights have to be well-defined in legislation and national regulators empowered to intervene in case of infringement of user's rights.
- A neutral network facilitates people's ability to produce content that stimulates demand for the Internet access services that is supposed to stimulate investments in Internet infrastructure.
- States have a role to play in balancing opposed political, social, and economic interests with regard to investments in network infrastructure and protection of end-users' fundamental rights.
- Competition is a key factor in order to foster network investments in both the developing and developed world. Network neutrality is a pro-competition principle that should be supported by pro competition policies.
- Network neutrality policies should favour investments, competition, and protect the health of the Internet ecosystem as a whole.
- Network neutrality promotes a non-discriminatory and transparent Internet traffic management leaving room for exceptions that should be clearly defined.
- Good regulation is instrumental to achieve network neutrality.

Reported by: Anonymous

WS195: The Internet age: Adapting to a new copyright agenda

It is necessary to ensure equal treatment of digital resources, the ability to acquire and lend to digital collections, to make sure people would not refuse the opportunity to buy or label e-books, to make sure we can safeguard the cultural and scientific heritage, to unlock "orphan" works, to ensure that copyright is an adequate instrument to stimulate the creation and dissemination of works and to protect the use of both traditional formats such as print in libraries, archives and digital works.

It was noted that there was a change in the market with the huge increase in the works' availability. In this context, it becomes hard to define what should be a fair return, the price paid by the writer in a circumstance where there is a saving in costs, e.g. transport and insurance. The pricing and distribution model must also be discussed despite the fact that in some ways copyright could be flexible.

There was no consensus around the role of copyright for the creation of digital content. It remains an unanswered question.

There was not agreement about how to deal with governmental regimes that abuse or misuse copyright law. There are instances where a strong copyright law environment can harm the freedom of expression and the access to information and, to some extent, could damage users privacy.

Governments should step in IGF discussions like this and listen. All the stakeholders' points of view should be taken from this kind of forum to trade negotiation processes. The role of the Internet Governance Forum was questioned if it cannot inform any processes such as TPP and WIPO. Is it a mere talk shop which does not affect any decisions made anywhere? There is not an executive body or staff who can listen and convert this discussion into a document, unless participants that themselves. It is necessary to understand the way the IGF works and turn it into something more actionable.

There is a need to go beyond discussion. Having all of these copyright debates in separate silos is not going to serve any purpose. Although it is definitely an enriching discussion—where people hear so many viewpoints and where we can understand what people are thinking—nothing about the outcome can be commented on unless we have a comprehensive way to answer questions. Having a series of conferences without practical answers will not lead us to a definitive and legitimate solution.

Reported by: Cristiana Gonzalez, University of São Paulo

WS208: Net Neutrality, Zero-Rating and Development: What's the Data?

A primary conclusion drawn from the workshop was that there is very little data currently available to support or refute claims of the impact of zero-rating programmes on Internet access and adoption in developing countries, and that there is a significant need for further research into a number of questions. Among these questions are:

- Do individuals who first access online services via a zero-rated application ultimately expand their use of online services, or do they remain primarily users of the zero-rated application?

- When zero-rating programmes are available, are there individuals who could afford full-Internet plans who instead use the zero-rated services because those services are sufficient to meet their demand? If yes, how does this affect the argument that zero-rating will ultimately lead to greater numbers of mobile broadband subscribers overall?

- Another key potential follow-up action is to engage additional telecommunications carriers directly in these research questions; these operators are best positioned to provide data about Internet adoption and use among their subscribers. There is also a need for better information about how one operator's decision to offer a zero-rating program affects other mobile network operators in the same region.

One panelist noted that Myanmar could present an informative case study in the coming year, as the country has recently opened its telecommunications sector and one of the three mobile carriers now operating in Myanmar is offering Facebook to subscribers. Studying the rates of mobile Internet penetration and use in Myanmar across the carriers that do and do not offer zero-rated programmes could provide valuable insight into the short-term effect of these programmes on a national Internet access market.

One panelist noted that studying analogous efforts to "prime" people for Internet access—for example, providing telecenters in a community—could provide useful evidence of how an initial introduction to Internet access affects perceived relevance and demand for mobile Internet access.

As policymakers, human rights advocates, industry, and others deliberate on the best way to increase the number of people with access to the open Internet, it is crucial that we do not overlook the continuing need to demonstrate the potential benefits of Internet access to people in economically and geographically diverse contexts.

Zero-rated services provide a limited form of access to online services, which is a key component to increasing adoption of Internet, but they raise important questions about other key components: developing local capacity in creating content and services is vital, and increasing digital literacy skills among new Internet users is essential. It is not clear that zero-rating programmes are well situated to support the development of these skills.

CDT looks forward to proposing a follow-up workshop at the IGF in Brazil in 2015 to discuss these important issues further, as more data about the implementation and effects of zero-rating programmes becomes available.

<div align="right">Reported by: Anonymous</div>

No conclusions or follow-up actions were documented for the following workshops:

- WS41: Policy to Promote Broadband Access in Developing Countries
- WS65: The Role of IXPs in Growing the Local Digital Economy
- WS74: Enabling Affordable Access: Changing Role of the Regulator
- WS136: Internet as an Engine of Growth and Development
- WS198: Social and Economic Justice Issues in Global IG

6.1.2. IGF and the Future of the Internet Ecosystem

Highlights of topics discussed

- Accountability and transparency
- The benefits of participating on an equal footing
- Capacity building
- Developing more robust, documented outcomes from IGF

Sessions that covered this sub-themes at IGF 2014

1. Main Session: Policies Enabling Access, Growth and Development on the Internet

Going into Istanbul, the following questions were developed for discussion in the main session:

What are the key issues, problems, and challenges that your organization focuses on in the IG space?

1. Speakers from relevant groups are invited to comment on specific activities or events that they consider relevant for global fora/activities/events on the Internet Governance Ecosystem: NETmundial, WSIS+10 HL, CSTD, ITU, ICANN, UNGA WSIS Review, and other relevant activities and events, identifying both positive and negative contribution to the Global IG process.

2. Evolution of the multi-stakeholder engagement (MS) in your organization—how is MS evolving in the intergovernmental system: challenges.

3. Do all problems require the same approach of multi-stakeholder engagement?—e.g. differentiation of approaches to the Internet governance of various stakeholders and in different fora?

4. Your views on the contributions and value in IGF to date.

5. What do you think are the key issues that are driving IG ecosystem development?

6. The Future of IGF—How should it evolve and change? Are there new competitors to the IGF?

7. What role should the IGF play to catalyze broader engagement by different government agencies, more stakeholders?

8. Are negotiated outcomes from IGF meetings feasible? What are the issues with moving into negotiation of outcomes?

9. Is it time to call for and develop processes for a more active role in developing consensus in key areas? If so, what are the possible changes to the IGF structure, processes and resources?

10. Can structured working groups, such as the Best Practice Forums piloted at IGF 2014, and other activities offer an opportunity to help resolve the inherent tension between inclusive conversation and effective decision-making that can be taken forward into other fora, as called for in the Tunis Agenda, Para 72(g)?

11. Are there any opportunities for the MAG and other IGF structural design processes and bodies to be made more inclusive, transparent and/or democratic, to help stakeholders feel more ownership?

Workshops:

There were a total of 16 workshops associated with the sub-themes related to the theme, IGF and the Future of the Internet Ecosystem.

1. WS31: Internet Governance: a case for variable geometry?

2. WS49: The impact of (non-)adoption of Internet standards on cyber security

3. WS80: ccTLDs: partners in developing local "IG literacy"

4. WS95: Working together: initiatives to map and frame IG

5. WS96: Accountability challenges facing Internet governance today
6. WS118: Discussion on multi-stakeholderism in Africa
7. WS124: Debates: Future IG Architecture
8. WS134: AIGF Meeting: Future of Internet and Perspective for Africa
9. WS139: Evaluating MS Mechanisms to Address Governance Issues
10. WS140: The Future of the Global and Regional IGFs Post 2015
11. WS152: Internet Governance: Challenges, Issues, and Roles
12. WS153: Institutionalizing the "Clearing House" Function
13. WS157: Crowdsourcing a Magna Carta for "The Web We Want"
14. WS173: Youth involvement in Internet Governance
15. WS191: ICANN Globalization in an Evolving IG Ecosystem
16. WS196: IGF and Enhanced Cooperation, Parallel Tracks or Connected

Areas where consensus is emerging

There was strong consensus that the **IGF's mandate should be renewed** beyond 2015.

There was wide agreement that **stable and sustainable funding is needed** for the IGF.

There was strong agreement that **IGF needed to produce more tangible, documented outcomes.**

Areas of ongoing debate

There is still a **variety of opinions on how IGF's funding should be secured**. Some believe that the United Nations should fund the IGF as part of its regular budget, while others believe key Internet organizations should contribute more, while others believe it is important for the wider Internet governance community to financially support the IGF.

The **precise form of IGF's outputs are still subject to debate**, with some wanting IGF to develop recommendations on Internet governance issues, while others believed that negotiating outcomes would prevent IGF's ability to facilitate well-informed decision-making by hosting open and honest exchanges of information and opinions.

Associated with the above, there is also some debate about **whether IGF should remain a discussion forum**, as tasked by the WSIS Tunis Agenda for the Information Society, or w**hether it was time to move to a new phase of implementation** of Internet governance ideas and policies.

Comparison of discussion with previous IGF discussions on the topic

The future of IGF was a significant topic of discussion during IGF 2009, Sharm el Sheikh, with the United Nations due shortly afterward to discuss the renewal of the IGF's initial five-year mandate.

Documents or actions that came out of the discussions

A multi-stakeholder group of participants **drafted a statement to send to the United Nations** to request a renewal of the IGF mandate and a longer cycle for each mandate given

to the IGF. Discussion on the draft continued online after the meeting, with a number of signatories signing the online statement at:

http://igfcontinuation.org

Community suggestions and recommendations on ways forward

In the main session, there were suggestions to:

- Take the knowledge, expertise and passion about the Internet and how it is governed to other communities and to encourage other communities to engage in Internet governance.
- **Take the learning captured from IGFs back to other forums** discussing Internet governance issues.
- Strengthen the IGF and encourage more stakeholders to participate in Internet governance by **supporting regional and national IGFs**.
- There was strong consensus that the **IGF's mandate should be renewed** beyond 2015.
- Support ways to **provide stable and sustainable funding** for the IGF.
- **Increase inter-sessional work** between IGFs. In particular, before IGF 2015, 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 2015 in Brazil.
- **Create an IGF "multi-stakeholder council" or steering committee** that focuses on IGF outputs, as well as the existing MAG, which focuses on forum preparations.
- **Increase cross-fertilization between the growing network of national and regional IGFs and the global IGF**.
- Below are the conclusions and suggestions that were developed by workshops on the sub-theme, IGF and the Future of the Internet Ecosystem:

WS31: Internet Governance: a case for variable geometry?

Civil society: while we are used to thinking about the locus of decisions as being decided in advance, (for instance you are committed to a UN institution or to bilateral negotiations) with variable geometry, your choice of decision-making venue becomes part of the strategy itself.

This has a series of implications:

- A move towards regionalism: different actors are choosing to opt in and allocate certain issues to each venue based on what they perceive to be their interests. Therefore, these venues include: the European Commission but also the OECD, the G7 and the G20.
- The importance of coercive force is reduced. Most of these situations arise where there is no clear allocation of decision-makers. Therefore, it is necessary to attract people to your proposed venue. But this does not happen by using negative inducements but typically by positive inducements.
- This implies that instead of worrying about your own interest exclusively, you have to think of it as collective solution: how to get people to cooperate.
- In this sense, it is a fundamental change in what we are doing, and in this context, the Internet Governance Forum has a chance to play a very distinctive role in this space.

Government: accountable to citizens

- Governments have a specific role: law enforcement, making regulations. There are many subjects in the hands of the private sector and some other organizations, but at the same time, there is need for regulation and reviews by governments at the local level. So this makes the role of government more challenging because governments are accountable to their citizens.

Technical community: preserving bottom up approach and offering flexible and decentralized solutions to governance issues

- Thinking in a multi-stakeholder way is an approach. And therefore, every community is likely to adapt aspects of it to be able to address and solve problems. Problems are becoming more complex and sometimes even unsolvable. But one can narrow the complexity and derive some solutions. This process requires expertise and flexibility.

- Leadership is voluntary and depends on the subject matter. In other words, as different stakeholders gravitate towards a problem, it becomes evident who actually are the best people to address the problems. You can see it in the passion and in the issues that they raise. So let this process happen organically.

- For some organizations, variable geometry is a kind of lifeblood. It means establishing decentralized collaborative processes. There is consensus on this idea, and it is important to champion Telecom Italia for taking public leadership on this matter.

- But what we do not have yet is a very widespread understanding outside our Internet community as to how to implement some of these ideas. How to take the next step. And perhaps that has partly to do with the lack of familiarity with these issues. But we should embrace this process. I do not think it matters whether you start either from a topic or from a country. There should be many pathways, many platforms

- And the IGF is a marvelous place to pull those together. To see the common threads. And to come together both here, globally, but also at regional IGFs to implement this process.

Regulatory agencies: variable geometry is a way to realize a more effective governance of the Internet

- Variable geometry is a very interesting idea because through differentiation of responsibilities in the Internet governance process, it is possible to strike a balance between wide participation, which is a basic principle of the Internet governance, and effective implementation in the Internet governance process.

- In this context, regulators could introduce a new form of expertise in the definition of core global principles, helpful to design better Internet governance.

Business: variable geometry as a forward looking approach to Internet governance

- The technological and economic environment of the Internet has dramatically changed since the mid 1990s. Today, the Internet is much more diverse and dynamic than in the past. The governance has become more complex. For instance, some issues like privacy and cyber security are now at the forefront of the global debate, with other more traditional issues such as the coordination of the Internet technical infrastructure calling for a timely and effective globalization of ICANN and IANA functions.

- It is necessary to recognize that the relevant stakeholders may vary from issue to issue. That is exactly the concept of variable geometry. Therefore, what is needed

is a better match between governance issues and relevant stakeholders. Therefore, the multi-stakeholder model, based on the concept of variable geometry, is the right response to the increasingly complex global governance process. It can ensure both the preservation of the main features of the current multi-stakeholder model and, at the same time, its evolutionary change.

- This approach is also fully consistent with the recommendations of the high level panel on global Internet cooperation and global governance mechanism through the partnership formed between the ICANN and the WEF.

Reported by: Lorenzo Pupillo, Telecom Italia

WS49: The impact of (non-)adoption of Internet standards on cyber security

There were a few tangible outputs from this session and identifiable areas where further debate is advocated.

1. Everyone on the panel agreed that, from a technical point of view, the Internet is working very well and technical standards make that possible.

2. Industry participants were well contented with how Internet standards are applied and see no need for interference from other players. Adoption is voluntary as is participation in processes.

3. From the technical community, there are some concerns on the (speed of) (voluntary) adoption of Internet standards and best practices. It sees a need for interaction with other actors, e.g. governments or consumer organizations, but the way to go about it is unclear and needs further debate.

4. Governments have seen a clear need to enter the arena, e.g. through interaction on standards and best practices. It was said that there is a clear market failure on the side of the Internet industry where adoption of Internet standards and best practices is concerned.

5. From the producer side of industry, it was said that implementation is not always easy. It is not a matter of just doing so. There can be (many) unforeseen technical effects and implications to software and networks, to costumers and the cost may be considerable. These investments do not always have a direct or even indirect effect on a company's (financial) results.

6. Consumers do not really have a role in the technical debate, but want to have one. Real consensus must be reached in the future.

7. There may be roles for different actors that are not foreseen at present and/or are not present at the moment in this debate.

8. The whole panel agreed that anti-trust and cartel law does not apply to processes as described here.

9. There was strong dissent in the panel on who has to lead on security: the consumer or the industry?

The panel participants were not able to come up with joint final recommendations. NLIGF draws up the following conclusions.

1. There is a clear need for further debate and interaction between different actors.

2. One of the focus points could be on costs. It is felt that these do not necessarily have to be carried by the ISPs alone, although they are often the ones having to implement measures and bearing the cost fully at present.

3. What are the pressure points concerning swift(er) implementation? Peer pressure, government regulation, finances? Etc.

4. What actors could speed up implementation by economic pressure or stimulus?

5. Which actors were missing in this debate?

The NLIGF acknowledges that, on this topic, there was no consensus reached at all on how to approach the topic further, nor on how actors need to engage in the future and even whether there is a will to do so. Several participants agreed on the fact that most relevant actors meet at the IGF. At the same time, NLIGF deems this topic of utmost importance where a safer and more secure Internet is concerned. It advises the IGF Secretariat to pass judgment on whether this topic is eligible for further interaction between different actors e.g. in the form of a Best Practice Forum and has reported it as such in the "emerging issues" session at the IGF.

Reported by: Sophie Veraart, NL IGF

WS80: ccTLDs: partners in developing local "IG literacy"

To sum up, Internet governance literacy is largely based on Internet literacy. But it is also worth asking ourselves who is an Internet literate and if we can be fully Internet and/or IG-literate. The Internet environment is full of documents that are barely readable and therefore, the path to IG-literacy is extremely long. The ccTLD managers and the ccTLD regional organizations will continue to be key communication channels to promote local IG-literacy and make IG more accessible to all.

All the ccTLD managers agreed that most of their stakeholders and the local communities are not so interested in Internet governance as a whole, but are rather more concerned about specific themes such as privacy, content, surveillance, access, security, development, network neutrality, the digital divide, IANA accountability. Privacy, network neutrality and accessibility are important topics for most local Internet communities, and that is why several registry managers got more involved in making sure they are addressed properly at international level.

Reported by: Peter Van Roste, CENTR

WS95: Working together: initiatives to map and frame IG

Roundtable participants:

1. Agreed that mapping exercises would never be complete, given new issues and IG mechanisms emerge every year.

2. Agreed that it was not possible to produce a completely neutral output from any single mapping exercise as each organization or collective that produces a mapping activity brings particular politics or biases to the table, even in the initial decision to conduct such an exercise.

3. Agreed that despite individual biases of individual mapping processes, collectively, IG data collators, publishers and mappers could, together, produce a more diverse network of information sources and mapped outcomes that could help overcome individual weaknesses inherent in specific projects.

4. Decided that it was useful to have an informal mechanism for the many different mapping and framing projects being supported and funded by different sources to communicate with each other and support a more diverse and robust network of initiatives to map and frame IG.

5. Agreed to create an informal mailing list of participants from the processes discussed in the workshop with a view to sharing information, experiences and publicizing each other's activities to stakeholder communities that might not be aware of other mapping and framing activities underway. The informal mailing list may lead to a more structured form of interaction in future.

Reported by: Anonymous

WS96: Accountability challenges facing Internet governance today

Below are direct quotes from the workshop, followed by more detail on the points that were made:

1. "What accounts for the intense interest in ICANN accountability? And almost no interest in accountability across the actual entire ecosystem of management of critical Internet resources."

   Rather than view ICANN accountability as the sole focus of Internet governance accountability discussions, it would be more beneficial to the health of Internet governance to look at the entire spectrum of institutions and mechanisms within the system, including:

   - cyber security governance mechanisms
   - standard setting institutions
   - interconnection agreements
   - infrastructure operators
   - Internet intermediaries

2. "Accountability is for everybody and at all levels and we share that."

   Accountability was seen to be operating at many layers—from the end user through to the technical bodies and infrastructure operators. Some accountability mechanisms are more formal--such as legal processes--and can be easily called on by stakeholders with the capacity to do so. Other forms of accountability mechanisms, however, are needed to enable other parts of the Internet governance ecosystem--such as Internet users--to participate in holding other Internet governance players accountable. A particular dimension of accountability to be considered in the Internet governance context was how global and national-based accountability interacted and could build on each other's strengths.

3. "One of the interesting things about accountability is stakeholder group boundaries."

   Neat stakeholder boundaries tend to blur as new Internet governance issues emerge. For example, the emergence of new gTLDs has blurred the boundaries between what was traditionally seen as distinct registry, registrar and other stakeholder groups such as governments and the traditional business sector. Now all stakeholder types are managing new gTLDs, which makes it less easy to identify what interests and hats stakeholders are wearing in different discussions.

4. "Things are distributed and yet none of us quite knows how it works."

   It was noted that the nature of the Internet had changed the clearer lines of accountability in place in telecommunications before market liberalization in the 1980s. No longer was a single incumbent provider clearly responsible for services, but under the Internet model, connectivity, applications, etc., responsibility, and therefore accountability, become diffused amongst many players.

5. "How do things differ from one region to another? ... Accountability may have some regional diversity there—cultural diversity."

    It was noted that not all cultures would be equally at home reading through hundreds of documents in English and feel satisfied that a process labeled 'transparent and accountable' was accountable to their needs.

6. "Choice is a luxury we don't all have."

    One of the mechanisms of market-based accountability is the ability for the market to take its business elsewhere. However, in the world of Internet governance, competition does not always exist. In many developing countries, in particular, there is no competition in the marketplace that can be leveraged to hold a monopoly provider accountable. In cases like this, raising awareness and framing the policymaking becomes very important.

7. "When people understand what the policy is and that there is no way around it, no special exceptions, that is then accountability."

    Policy processes in Internet governance need to be open, fair, transparent and clear. It should not be possible for someone claiming to represent the people to request special treatment for any single person (abuse of power). It was suggested that if faced by such an abuse of power, one way to respond was with uniform openness and transparency: in accommodating such a request, it would also be necessary to inform other affected parties why they had been treated differently.

8. There are different forms of accountability available for individuals, organizations and communities.

    There is a lot of experience with organizational accountability, but less experience with how to ensure communities are accountable. Community participant accountability is associated with being transparent on the interests the members represent and conflicts of interest that may have a bearing on the community's processes and decision-making. In addition, it was suggested that there needed to be enforceable sanctions available within Internet governance communities to make members of those communities accountable for their behaviour.

9. "How do you manage the multiple representations of wearing many hats?"

    In Internet governance, individuals often play multiple roles in multiple forums. It was suggested that there are ways to ensure accountability in such an environment:

    a. personal transparency: be clear about your background and history

    b. formal transparency: maintain a register of participants' statements of interests

    c. be clear about which role you are speaking from

    d. have clear conflict of interest policies that enable everyone in the community to be aware when they should or should not be participating in a discussion or decision-making process that they may be seen to have a conflict of interest in.

10. Accountability of processes that have input from both individuals and collective voices

    In terms of how processes can be accountable in the face of having input from both individual and collective voices, there was discussion that it depended on how the process itself was defined. For example, the IETF uses meritocracy rather than democracy, meaning that no matter how well-funded or powerful any participant may be, the characteristic that guides adoption of ideas is the quality of the idea. Similarly, an ex-board chair of

an Internet-related organization noted that when faced with lots of inputs from many different sources—some with more clear sources of power than others—his approach was always to "try to make data-driven decisions rather than personality-driven decisions". It was noted that in democratic processes, it could be more difficult to "differentiate between real interests and when there is lobbying behind and money", which is where transparency in declaring interests and financial support become important tools for ensuring accountability of participants. It was noted, however, that while meritocracy enabled the best ideas to thrive, it did not automatically enable equal participation by less well-resourced stakeholders, particularly from developing countries. In this way, while a meritocracy is accountable to those with the minimum level of resources to participate, it may lack accountability to those who would be interested in participating but lacked the resources to do so.

11. "It's easy to be part of a community when you know the codes, you know the processes, you know the people there. But there are enormous barriers to enter into these communities from the outside."

Although it had been established earlier in the workshop that transparency, through producing documentation, was not necessarily a culturally appropriate form of accountability in all situations, it was also noted that access to documentation did have the benefit of enabling new entrants to more easily understand the processes and to actively evaluate and improve those processes.

Finally, some quotes summing up the workshop:

Laura DeNardis: "There's no one solution to accountability. We have different kinds of institutions, and we have different kinds of tasks. We've talked about the IETF as a model that works. And I agree with that. And even in a situation like that that works completely well, there are still barriers to involvement for everyday people. People are involved in their individual capacities, but many work for corporations that pay to send them there. So we can't have a democratic, completely participatory environment but we can have processes that are open in terms of the potential for participation, open in terms of how things are implemented and procedurally, transparency, all those kinds of things and then the result is open in how they actually proceed once the technology is developed. [...] There's not one solution for everything, but different kinds of approaches depending upon what the layer is of the Internet Governance task."

Patrik Falstrom: "My recommendation would be for people to think about people and organizations, private and public, to think about what responsibilities you have yourself. And then what you can do yourself about it. And then everything else needs to talk to each other about. I think it's a little too much finger pointing at others and look for things that you can take care of yourself."

Adiel Akplogan: "Accountability in this Internet Governance environment is about everybody. [...] And it is also a process. It is not something that can happen overnight. It's improved with the maturity of organizations, the maturity of the community, of the understanding of what is at stake. So that is an ongoing process. But also from a developing point of view, accountability has a cost, a financial cost."

Reported by: Samantha Dickinson, Lingua Synaptica

WS118: Discussion on multi-stakeholderism in Africa

The panellists to the roundtable suggested the follow-up actions below:

1. In order to improve the knowledge of specific Internet governance issues such as freedom of expression, privacy protection or cybersecurity, pre-events to IGF covering specific thematic areas should be organized.

2. By the next IGF meeting, there are a number of areas that need technical clarity and input on. In terms of Internet governance from an African perspective, some of the critical issues that African governments are facing are broadband access, pricing and quality of service. It was suggested that African governments should address these issues through bilateral agreements between governments in order to exchange ideas and resources.

3. Poor access to broadband cannot be addressed only from a supply-side perspective. Demand-side stimulation is as much important and it needs policy consideration.

4. The creation of an information clearinghouse was suggested as a space to know who is doing what on Internet governance and Internet policy in Africa.

5. It was recommended that the African Union should pass a resolution allowing delegations to international meetings such as ITU meetings or other UN meetings to be based on multi-stakeholders principles.

6. Mechanisms to improve the participation of African governments to Internet governance processes need to be devised. There is also a need to involve not only ICT Ministers but also other Ministers in Internet governance processes through developing inter-ministerial collaboration on Internet policy issues.

Reported by: Anonymous

WS124: Debates: Future IG Architecture

Debate 1: "This House believes ICANN should be accountable to governments (or an inter-governmental institution)"

Pro:

- Governments have responsibilities for taxes, freedoms.
- ICANN is a private entity under the U.S. laws.
- Governments are accountable to public; ICANN accountable to a U.S. court?
- There needs to be a mechanism for protecting public interests.
- Democracy should be the main principle, we shouldn't try to replace it.
- Multi-stakeholderism is not a participatory democracy.
- Governance includes transparency, inclusiveness, accountability, equality and balance—so should ICANN.
- Without these principles "what are we left with—just piles of names and numbers".
- Enforcement of decisions needs coercive power, and only governments have it.
- Big business rules ICANN.
- Governments should not be only stakeholder involved, but accountability needs to be to governments.

Con:

- ICANN has an accountability mechanism to its community.

- Other stakeholders have stake in ICANN's work and need to be and are involved.
- Issues covered by ICANN are too complex for one stakeholder only, including for governments.
- Governments should be only one of stakeholders to whom ICANN should be accountable.
- There needs to be a bottom-up process which can't exist within the intergovernemtal organizations system.
- Public interests are represented in ICANN through the involvement of other stakeholders.
- Democracy is imperfect. Multi-stakeholder model helps to improve it.
- ICANN processes need to be localized, decentralized.
- Governments are accountable to citizens, so ICANN can be as well: to public—global. community and users—rather than to governments.
- Distributed accountability for effective participation.
- Accountability to governments may block innovations, it may make ICANN more bureaucratic institution and away from users.
- It is not about power, it is about principles.

Questions:
- Is democracy failing as a system, so we are searching for ways to replace or patch it?
- Minority of governments really represent citizens.
- What is the public interest, who decides and how?

Debate 2: "This House believes 'respective roles' of stakeholders in IG imply their participation on an 'equal footing'"

Pro:
- Decision-making process in IG by governments is problematic, there needs to be expertise and checks and balance.
- Avoiding power concentration, respect the interests of marginalized groups.
- IG should go beyond consulting other stakeholders, bringing them in the decision-shaping process.
- Expertise is important in a very complex area like Internet governace.
- Policies are implementable only if owned by wider public, i.e. if brought up with participation of all stakeholders.
- UN institutions also need to change to embrace multi-stakeholder model.
- The process is more legitimate with diversity of stakeholders involved.
- Multi-stakeholder process empowers communities.
- Power distribution is more important than power concentration.

Con:
- "Multi-stakeholder" is not well defined.
- Who should participate—who is "all"? Not everyone can participate

- Criteria for representation are clear with governments, not with others; representation is very important when decisions are brought.
- Different roles of different stakeholders in different moments of decision-making.
- Social contract: all people are equal; equality is most important.
- "Equality through inequity"—but "equality" is often fake with dominance of some players.
- All should be involved, but with different roles in different stages of the process.
- Policy shaping phase should have many equally; decision-making should be by governments.
- Example that some stakeholders in some stages need to lead is also tech community in standard-setting (IETF).

Questions:
- Multi-stakeholderism is a new form of global policy making not only in Intenet governance.
- What does it mean "equal footing" or "equal"?
- Multi-stakeholderism is complex. There are different positions even among same stakeholder groups.
- How to form a representative model in multi-stakeholder approach?
- "Equality of opportunity" does not equal "quality of opportunity".
- Equal is only when all stakeholders are in the room, but even then not everyone has the same quality of opportunity (remote participation is an example of unequal quality. Lack of capacity is another that impacts quality).
- "Equal footing for remote participants" may be another debate
- How equality outside the room impacts equality in the room?
- Capacity building angle of quality: understand the issue; be able to express and skilled to focus on arguments; have chance to express through the right session.

Debate analysis notes: Comment was made that this debate format reduced the arguments to their essential elements. The debaters were engaged and obviously knew their topics.

The workshop underscored the fact that content alone is insufficient to carry an argument. Delivery has a very important part to play in communication. We forget, as speakers, that we have a duty to engage our audience, to make it as easy as possible for them to follow what we are saying, and to retain their interest throughout. It's simply not enough to have good content—to be effective, that content has to be well-delivered.

Remote participation note: The importance of remote participation was underscored by the fact that the remote participation vote decided the results of one of the debates.

Reported by: Ginger Paque, DiploFoundation

WS139: Evaluating MS Mechanisms to Address Governance Issues

Joy Liddicoat:
- We should affirm the notion that we are in the process of change. Evolution of the Internet and multi-stakeholder mechanisms should be organic. The best of what we have now will help us grow into the future.

- Must continue to share best practices and thoughtfully consider what has worked and what was less successful. Sharing failures in constructive ways will help us to building better mechanisms going forward.

Baher Esmat:

- A theme of IGF 2015 has been the need to create a more action-oriented process. In pursuit of these goals, it is important to support national and regional multi-stakeholder initiatives and process. It is important to support the establishment and continuity of these approaches.
- Developing robust national and regional initiatives will be key to engaging greater developing country participation in the IGF. We must work to ensure that developing countries have the tools, capacities, and resources to experience the multi-stakeholder model in their own countries.

Phil Rushton:

- There is no one answer concerning "the best" multi-stakeholder mechanisms. Many mechanisms exist, and we need to continue gathering evidence of their efficacy.
- We need to better understand the relationships between the ICT/Internet-centered world and other sectors whose own activities have an impact on governance of the Internet.

Jandyr Santors, Jr.:

- We must continue to be creative, there is no single solution given the complexity of the Internet and the complicated challenges it creates.
- We must be ambitious and "dare to innovate."
- We must ensure that transparency remains a central element of the multi-stakeholder model. This creates confidence in the process.
- Creating a predictable process also will generate confidence that the multi-stakeholder model and produce outcomes.

Mohamed el Dahshan:

- In endeavoring to improve multi-stakeholder mechanisms, do not build new layers of bureaucracy.
- Need to be honest with ourselves to properly understand where improvements evolutions to multi-stakeholder mechanisms may be needed.

Reported by: Barbara Wanner, US Council for International Business

WS152: Internet Governance: Challenges, Issues, and Roles

The session addressed a number of key areas that will increase an understanding of Internet governance such as the need to coordinate knowledge and understanding as part of the multi-stakeholder capacity building process. The panel also identified the need to address the inclusiveness of the process so that the common understanding can be established among all parties. There are many tools that could be used to assist in the process of establishing this common ground, data mining, outreach and feedback as well as using experiences gained from the NetMundial process to look forward towards having the IGF focus on a taxonomy framework to produce collaborative outcomes and substantive results that can then be used to further address the knowledge and participation gaps that were noted.

All participants agreed that active multi-stakeholder discussions are of utmost importance so as to break the silo effect and to create necessary agreements and polices from the trade world that support digital products.

<div align="right">Reported by: Karen Mulberry, Internet Society</div>

WS153: Institutionalizing the "Clearing House" Function

The panellists highlighted the growing complexity of the Internet governance ecosystem, the coordination and information gap that currently exists, and the challenges that developing countries in particular are faced with in this space. In the absence of neutral and easily accessible material about existing and emerging issues, relevant existing processes and potential solutions, actors might turn to information that's being selected from a narrow or particular perspective, creating sub-optimal policy outcomes.

The panellists and the audience highlighted existing initiatives that are aiming to circulate knowledge, and facilitate information sharing and collaboration in the field of Internet governance. Greater coordination and strengthening of these existing initiatives was seen as desirable.

It was noted that we are reaching a point similar to where we were ten years ago, when the IGF was created, where there is a clear demand to determine what kind of change the institutional ecosystem might require to help provide the kinds of functionalities that address stakeholders' needs.

Existing gaps in the ecosystem should be addressed, while further empowering existing organizations and actors. Developing a clearing house function with its various elements is a good way forward, but it will require further dialogue and broad community input to make sure that the right modalities are found. It was highlighted that the function would need to strike a delicate balance between greater coordinated action that facilitates good policy-making and the risk of centralization.

In terms of institutional solutions, there was general support to connect such an initiative to the IGF, as this would correspond to the original mandate of the Forum and would, at the same time, add legitimacy to the initiative. However, in order for this to happen and the IGF to perform such a function, it would need to be strengthened and allocated appropriate resources. Workshop participants identified the 2014 IGF initiative to collate and present best practice as an example of how the Forum could evolve by incorporating parts of what could constitute the clearing house function.

Workshop participants also highlighted early engagement and buy-in from key Governments—especially from the developing world—and other stakeholder as a crucial element in terms of building credibility and getting political and broader community support for such an initiative.

<div align="right">Reported by: Lea Kaspar, Global Partners Digital</div>

WS173: Youth involvement in Internet Governance

The workshop is about gathering the ideas from both sides, policy making body and youth leaders on how can the two groups work together to engage youth on the Internet policy discussion. Suggestions have been made in two periods, respectively, before the conference and during the conference.

Before the conference, youth and policy makers agreed to enhance a regional platform for youth engagement, for example, including strengthening the regional IGF, putting IGF efforts in respective languages according to the region. Enhancing capacity building is also another issue that was agreed upon by both policy makers and youths to let their voices reach the policy making level. Suggestions included youth training and facilitation in order to enable them to speak on panels. Youth participants also agreed that raising awareness is another key for youth engagement in Internet governance issue. Suggestions made including better utilization of social media, as well as resources allocated to Internet governance issues since primary education.

To better facilitate youth participation during the conference, most of the youth agreed that authorizing IGF and letting it make statements is a possible solution to put forward ideas and good points discussed in IGF. Youth and policy makers also agreed that to let youth more easily approach hot topics in IGF, more simple language could be used for youth panels. Youth involvement outside of the conference can also support youth engaging. To enhance the impact of IGF on other youths, some youth panelists also suggested using social media as a channel.

Consensus on bringing up youth participation to the next level with an implementation plan:

- Creation of a resource pool for bridging the developed and developing countries Internet governance policy discussion:
  - For youth to register their profile and expertise, and organizers can find youth for relevant panels
  - Feedback tool to the organizers
  - Toolkit for preparing youth to be ready for the Internet Governance discussion
  - Twitter blog for related news and content
- Encourage adults to listen to youth:
  - Come up with measures for the organizers to keep track of:
    - Percentage of youth participation
    - Youngest person in the room
    - Average age of participants
  - Campaign next year on "Yes, I want to listen to youth!"
    - Distribute rubber band to adult participants, participants who are ready to talk can wear it, that youth can easily identify and actively approach one with a rubber band for short chat in the IGF venue
- Come up with official recommendation from youth.
- Having youth member on the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group in IGF.

Reported by: Ambassadors of Netmission.Asia

WS191: ICANN Globalization in an Evolving IG Ecosystem

1. The workshop showed that considerable developments had taken, and were taking, place at ICANN;
2. That the process was complex and very much depended on the successful transition of the U.S./NTIA responsibilities with respect to IANA functions;

3. That metrics were needed to track ICANN globalization in terms of the effect it had on DNS sector.

In terms of follow-up, it was thought by some that we needed to return to this theme in future years to see what progress had been made.

Reported by: Anonymous

No conclusions or follow-up actions were documented for the following workshops:

- WS134: AIGF Meeting: Future of Internet and Perspective for Africa
- WS140: The Future of the Global and Regional IGFs Post 2015
- WS157: Crowdsourcing a Magna Carta for "The Web We Want"
- WS196: IGF and Enhanced Cooperation, Parallel Tracks or Connected

6.1.3. The Internet, Human Rights and Enhancing Digital Trust

This section combines discussion on two of the sub-themes of IGF 2014: "Internet and human rights" and "Enhancing Digital Trust. Neither sub-theme had a main session devoted to it; however, in total, there were 28 workshops that had one of the two sub-themes as its main topic, with another 19 workshops also having a focus on particular aspects of human rights.

Highlights of topics discussed

- Privacy standards and procedures for protection
- Privacy, trust and mobile Internet
- Child safety
- Post-Snowden digital trust
- Privacy, surveillance and the cloud
- Cybercrime and cybersecurity
- Internet blocking

Sessions that covered these sub-themes at IGF 2014

There were no main or focus sessions dedicated to these sub-themes at IGF 2014; however, there were a total of 18 workshops associated with the three sub-themes related to digital trust and human rights.

Enhancing Digital Trust:

1. WS1: Protecting Child Safety AND Child Rights
2. WS2: Mobile, Trust and Privacy
3. WS17: Privacy as Innovation II
4. WS19: Empowering Global Youth Through Digital Citizenship
5. WS43: Multi-Stakeholder Approaches to Cybersecurity Awareness
6. WS47: Enhancing Digital Trust in the Post-Snowden Era
7. WS71: Privacy, Surveillance, and the Cloud: One Year Later

8. WS77: Cybercrime Cooperation 4 Developing Countries: Int'l Frameworks
9. WS97: Will Cyberspace Fragment Along National Jurisdictions?
10. WS104: Cybersecurity for ccTLDs—Governance and Best Practices
11. WS107: Internet blocking: When Well-Intentioned Measures Go Too Far
12. WS129: Internet Tech and Policy: Privacy, Data Flows and Trust

Internet and Human Rights:

1. WS20: Launch UNESCO publication Digital Safety of Journalists
2. WS21: Intermediaries' Role and Good Practice in Protecting FOE
3. WS56: Researching Children's Rights in a Global, Digital Age
4. WS82: Alternative Routes Protecting Human Rights on the Internet
5. WS83: Human Rights for the Internet: From Principles to Action
6. WS91: Launch of an African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedoms
7. WS126: Fostering Respect by Companies for Internet Users' Rights
8. WS132: Online Advocacy and Women Rights: Obstacles and Successes
9. WS146: Anonymity by Design: Protecting While Connecting
10. WS149: Aligning ICANN Policy with Privacy Rights of Internet Users
11. WS154: Intelligent Risk Management in a Mobile Online Environment
12. WS158: Promoting Platform Responsibility For Content Management
13. WS188: Transparency Reporting as a Tool for Internet Governance
14. WS193: The Press Freedom Dimensions of Internet Governance
15. WS220: Transnational Surveillance and Cross-Border Privacy Protections
16. WS225: Online Freedoms and Access to Information Online

Areas where consensus is emerging

Amongst the participants in workshops related to human rights and digital trust, the following areas of consensus emerged:

- 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.
- There was agreement about the importance of the Human Rights Council resolution 20/8 2012, which affirmed **the same human rights we have offline also apply online**.

Areas of ongoing debate

There continue to be different perspectives on whether online surveillance is a breach of human rights and national sovereignty (eroding digital trust) or whether online surveillance is conducted to protect national sovereignty and the rights of citizens (enhancing digital trust).

Comparison of discussion with previous IGF discussions on the topic

In the early days of IGF, "digital trust" was discussed under the theme of "security" and focused more on the security of the infrastructure from the point of view of governments and technical operators and businesses. Topics such as spam, hacking and cybercrime dominated earlier discussions. Following news about wide-scale online surveillance programmes that aim to protect national security, discussions about security at IGF have begun to also place the user's desire for secure online activities within the "security" sub- theme, resulting in the reframing of the sub-theme to become "digital trust" at IGF 2014.

Similarly, human rights at IGF were previously discussed under the sub-theme, "openness", and focused to a large degree on freedom of information and freedom of expression. With the shift in security discussions, the human rights discussions have also adapted, with the human right to privacy becoming a key topic for IGF 2014.

Documents or actions that came out of the discussions

A synthesis of the various discussions on enhancing digital trust that took place during the ninth IGF was to 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.

A roundtable of organizers of workshops on the themes of enhancing digital trust and the Internet and human rights produced a statement:

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

https://www.apc.org/en/system/files/Message%20from%20IGF%202014_FINAL.pdf

Community suggestions and recommendations on ways forward

There were suggestions to:

- Encourage 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**.
- **Increase interaction between government entities and all other interested stakeholders** in ongoing and future deliberations on enhancing trust in cyberspace. As specific examples, there were suggestions to **increase multi-stakeholder 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.
- **Integrate related work by the ITU, the European Commission and similar organizations** into IGF's work on enhancing digital trust.

Below are the conclusions and suggestions that were developed by workshops on the sub-themes of digital trust and human rights:

Enhancing Digital Trust

WS1: Protecting Child Safety AND Child Rights

There were no follow up actions other than to encourage people to continue the discussion. There was a general consensus 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 youth and their rights of free expression, participation and privacy.

The overall consensus in the room is that children and youth do have rights not only to protection but of expression as well.

Reported by: Anonymous

WS2: Mobile, Trust and Privacy

The privacy/mobile big data discussion continues to be very important but is fundamentally different and new as compared to when we started this discussion. The mobility aspects of it make everything that much more complicated and that much more personal for each and every one of us.

- User trust is fundamental if mobile-derived data is to be used for meeting public policy objectives, and creating economic opportunities.
- New uses of mobile data (particularly in the IoT space) may pose new risks to citizens and consumers' privacy, particularly where the correlation of various data about an individual can lead to his/her identification. ACTION: Companies should consider such privacy implications when first designing services.
- There is a need for greater transparency over government access to private sector data was also raised as an issue.

Reported by: Yiannis Theodorou, GSM Association

WS17: Privacy as Innovation II

The speakers addressed a need to reframe the conversation about privacy. Privacy should not be viewed in opposition to innovation, but as a natural component addressing user demands for choice and control. Thus, privacy is not only a concept but a solution that addresses both user demands to control their content online with peers as well as the way in which businesses handle user data backstage. Privacy innovation needs to take into account data ownership, big data ethics, alternative business models, financial control, as well as user demands for convenience.

Organizations must incorporate a more diverse legal as well as technical expertise that addresses all of these areas. Particularly, solutions need to address user needs and demands. Users will choose convenience over privacy, and thus innovation must address both.

Choice and control was equated with privacy by youth participants who primarily use the most commonly known social media services. Generally, they do not know how their data is used by the services they use.

There is a need for a social and economic investment in alternative solutions and build on alternative business models and privacy by design. Users should not have to pay for privacy. Awareness of privacy issues among users is important and awareness of increasing privacy demands from users will be an incentive for companies to use privacy as innovation.

Participants expressed a need for a continuous exchange of knowledge in the field. There is a need for an international level playing field of privacy principles. The IGF was suggested as a framework for this. The moderator suggested that participants of the workshop express their interest in participating in a further discussion and exchange of information after the workshop by sending and email to the moderator. Others not participating in the workshop are invited to do the same.

Reported by: Gry Hasselbalch Lapenta, Media Council for Children and Young People

WS19: Empowering Global Youth Through Digital Citizenship

A key characteristic of digital citizenship is that it changes with the citizens, who define and co-create the concept as they learn and grow. So this is an open-ended workshop subject. The workshop is about gauging consensus and learning together as one another's perspectives are shared. Other key findings, if not conclusions, of the workshop is that intercultural understanding is becoming a core competency or literacy of citizenship (both online and offline) in this networked world and that Internet access is a key affordance, if not right, of citizens of all ages worldwide, because, without it, both participation and access to information are restricted.

As for follow-up actions, we hope to continue the conversation with this workshop and by supporting all other youth efforts to gain full stakeholder-level participation at the IGF. As our proposal indicated, this was not a panel of adults with one or two youth. This workshop was an open discussion that was youth-driven and adult facilitated. We would be happy to reduce even that adult role if youth participants ask us to. Our role in the workshop has diminished year by year; this year it was strictly organization and moderation. The reason is that, as the intended beneficiaries of policymaking and as expert users of connected technology, youth are needed in all processes that aim to benefit them, including the child protection area of the IGF. This is only logical, but it is also logic enshrined in the UNCRC.

Reported by: Anonymous

WS43: Multi-Stakeholder Approaches to Cybersecurity Awareness

When implementing a public-private partnership approach to cybersecurity, there are a few elements you should consider:

1. While having a centralized resource database of materials can be helpful, there needs to be the opportunity for localization of the materials. This not only helps address cultural issues but also technological issues (e.g. primary Web access via mobile as opposed to traditional fixed Internet).

2. It helps if organizations can leave their differences at the door. There can sometimes be tension between the various parties in the multi-stakeholder model in approaching these issues. In order to be successful, these differences need to be suppressed and focus needs to be place on the objective. This also helps build trust between participants. An "honest broker" can drive cooperation and build strategies between partners with potentially competing agents and interests.

3. The use of "multipliers" is a key element to success. This helps rapidly spread the message in a very efficient manner.

4. There has to be a shared responsibility between various parts of the multi-stakeholder community that will drive ownership of the single actionable message.

Reported by: Tiffany Barrett, National Cyber Security Alliance

WS47: Enhancing Digital Trust in the Post-Snowden Era

1. The panelists concurred that it is inappropriate to adopt one standard of legal protections for citizens and one for non-citizens, as privacy is a basic human rights issue. It was also noted that the Swedish legislation accords the same rights to Swedes and non-Swedes.

2. In terms of how to overcome what one audience member termed "the security versus privacy illusion," it is important to realize that protracted Internet surveillance is not a guarantor of security. Attempts to convince countries that they need to increase surveillance for security purposes should therefore be regarded as a fallacy.

Reported by: Caroline Baylon, The Royal Institute of International Affairs;
Samantha Bradshaw, Centre for International Governance Innovation

WS71: Privacy, Surveillance, and the Cloud: One Year Later

Governments should not pursue data localization, but rather, focus on transnational, multi-jurisdictional due-process mechanisms. Further, the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty (MLAT) process needs to be reformed. There must be a functional system whereby governments can cooperate to obtain information. While conflicts may arise between governments regarding access to data, a framework must be established to resolve these conflicts. Multilateral organizations should help extend the debate regarding government surveillance to the governments of developing economies, including a push for rule-of-law and judicial oversight. The linking of funding to developing economies with surveillance reforms may serve as a catalyst for change. The private sector should continue the trend towards transparency reporting. There must be greater government transparency.

Reported by: Anonymous

WS77: Cybercrime Cooperation 4 Developing Countries: Int'l Frameworks

From a developing country standpoint, the Budapest Convention is an ideal international best practice model that covers all the necessary elements including international cooperation and, most importantly, the only available international instrument with global reach. Panellists emphasized the importance of Mutual Legal Assistance Treaties (MLATS) for international cooperation and highlighted the positive impact of having effective cyber crime legislation on business and investment. The panellists also commented on the feeling of community engendered by acceding to the Budapest Convention and emphasized the importance of supporting other developing countries in this process. Participants highlighted that this was the only panel where the participants witnessed the discussion of a positive role of the government, and it was essential that more governments become aware of, support and take measures consistent with the Convention. Developing countries particularly stressed the importance of being provided capacity building and assistance from the Convention when discussing harmonizing cyber crime legislation since it is vital to ensure that any model legislation aims to be consistent with the Convention. This is particularly relevant given the unhelpful and technically and legally incorrect language sometimes used in certain recent model laws promoted by certain organizations which have suffered serious criticism by civil society, the technical community and the private sector. Avoiding such unhelpful outcomes and wastage of resource and instead utilizing the same resources to further the positive agenda of consistent, compatible and convergent legislation such as that undertaken in the form of the commonwealth model law was a more useful resource. Developing countries also require international funding and development assistance.

Reported by: Zahid Jamil, Developing Countries' Centre On Cyber Crime;
Zahra Rose Dean, Jamil & Jamil

WS97: Will Cyberspace fragment along national jurisdictions?

Fragmentation is a potential result of uncoordinated legal competition. It is therefore important to address the cause rather than the symptom. The workshop provided a clear confirmation that to avoid fragmentation, there is a need for dialogue and coordination between different stakeholders: procedural frameworks on an issue-by-issue basis are required to maintain transnational online spaces.

There was support for the proposals coming out of the global multi-stakeholder dialogue process facilitated by the Internet & Jurisdiction Project, including: a standardized transnational request format for domain seizures, content takedown and access to user data, as well as mutualized databases for authenticated points of contact, transparency statistics, national laws and procedures, and request logs.

The workshop also highlighted a certain number of processes that address the challenge of Internet and jurisdictions:

- Work on the free flow of information at the Council of Europe.
- Work on Internet universality at UNESCO.
- Work on "Völkerrecht des Netzes" (Global law of the Internet) by Germany.
- Work on the Open Internet by ISOC.

Moving forward, the Internet & Jurisdiction Project roadmap will be organized around the following tracks:

- Intensive stakeholder interactions and outreach to further refine and validate the draft framework.
- Design of the system's technical specifications.
- Detection, documentation and formalization of emerging procedural norms and standards.
- Definition of dispute management channels and procedures.
- Preparation of a pilot implementation with a core group of entities.

Reported by: Anonymous.

WS104: Cybersecurity for ccTLDs—Governance and Best Practices

There was near consensus that one of the key problems for ccTLDs in the context of cybersecurity was capacity building. The workshop heard that, in several regions of the world, regional cooperation—both formal and informal—was successful in sharing experiences, tools and knowledge between ccTLDs. The workshop also achieved some consensus that ccTLDs experience an evolutionary change regarding cybersecurity as they mature as organizations. It was noted, in particular, that the relationship between ccTLDs and government changes dramatically as the ccTLD matures in its approach to cybersecurity. What emerged was a clear need for more frequent sharing of information and tools—and venues to do this in a way that was economically and technically viable for ccTLDs at an early stage in their development.

Reported by: Mark McFadden, InterConnect Communications

WS107: Internet Blocking: When Well-Intentioned Measures Go Too Far

1. Accuracy
   - The blocking behavior should specifically target the resources that are causing the abusive behavior.

2. Precision
   - The blocking behavior targets exactly the resources that are causing the abusive behavior, includes all relevant resources and only those relevant resources.

3. Collateral damage avoidance
   - All possible measures should be taken to avoid collateral damage/over blocking.

4. Monitoring
   - The results of each precise targeted blocking action must be monitored to ensure precision and accuracy, with a very rapid "undo" function whenever overreach is indicated.

5. Transparency/Accountability
   - Important to measure impacts of blocking and publish results.
   - Transparency and accountability of government agencies are important as well.
   - Annual transparency reports[1] (such as done by Google,[2] Apple,[3] Teliasonera[4]) should be published by companies and other entities that provide blocking services.

6. Technological capacity
   - Good intentions are not a substitute for proper capacity planning or good system administration.

7. Anti-abuse
   - Anti-abuse policies and measures should be developed. There is a need to assume that criminals will be using the infrastructure.

8. Effectiveness
   - The proposed measures should be demonstrably effective against the behavior they are designed to prevent.

9. Jurisdiction
   - The authority proposing the measures should either have the authority to impose the measures on all parties to the communication, or should incentivize voluntary cooperation for those parties not within the authority's jurisdiction.

10. Guidelines
    - Guidelines are needed for those involved in Internet takedowns and blocking, ISPs and users using blocklists. Guidelines should include actions to implement when over blocking take place.

11. Reporting (False positives/over blocking)

---

[1] https://www.eff.org/who-has-your-back-2014

[2] http://www.google.com/transparencyreport/

[3] https://www.apple.com/privacy/transparency-reports/

[4] http://www.teliasonera.com/en/sustainability/transparency-report/

- A mechanism should exist to report when false positives or over blocking occurs. Ideally should be handled by a different entity that is doing the blocking.
- Challenges exist on how to report when blocking takes place in countries where there is weak rule of law.
- In certain countries informal trusted and confidential networks are needed to report incidents.

12. Build trust and relationships with the community

- Important to build trust and relationships with peering providers, ISPs, the technical and user community.

13. Swift and speedy communications often needed

- Mutual legal assistance treaties (MLATs) can be too slow to deal with some concerns. Additional communication processes that are quicker need to be developed.

14. Education/Support needed

- Blocking can take place for a variety of reasons that aren't immediately evident to users—such as issues with peering networks, intermediaries and upstream content hosts.
- Support needed to help developing country ISPs and other experts be able to address over-blocking efforts.
- Industry needs to be taken far more seriously as blocking can encompass entire AS numbers.
- Need to develop recommendations when selecting block lists.

15. Developing country challenges

- Challenges often exist in developing countries where a government entity is responsible for Internet blocking.

16. Privacy challenges of blocklists:

- There is a need to be aware of privacy issues with block lists.
- Need to recognize that personal identifiable information present in block lists that can be used by criminals to exploit victims.

Reported by: Robert Guerra

WS129: Internet Tech and Policy: Privacy, Data Flows and Trust

If this is not a zero sum game of trade-offs between competing priorities, then we need to identify measures that can create a "plus-sum" environment, by optimizing both trust and a pro-innovation environment. Here are the critical ideas raised during the discussion:

- Focus must be on optimizing all facets of this field, rather than on "balancing" priorities as if they are trade-offs in a zero-sum game.
- Strong support for use of cross-jurisdictional mechanisms that can work to reduce policy tensions and misunderstandings. Without such mechanisms that seek areas of overlap and interoperability, and that are willing to make some compromise to respect certain differences, we risk significant fragmentation and isolation. A constructive example was made of the APEC/Article 29 Working Group that is doing a mapping exercise of Privacy regimes.

- Promote rigorous procedures to apply with respect to government demands from companies for information for law enforcement/security purposes. These procedures should be clear and transparent, and there must be independent oversight and accountability on the part of government demanding information. More effort is necessary on this in most, if not all, jurisdictions.

- Transparency of practices and requirements is critical by all parties, to improve understanding and trust, and to identify opportunities for improvements.

- Investments should be made for stronger encryption in all areas of the ecosystem: at the edge services and devices, and in the core network backbones as well.

- Both governments and companies should invest substantially in both privacy and security by design, to optimize end user trust in innovative networks and services.

- Companies should continuously invest in security and encryption, to make unauthorized access more difficult. Never ending process.

- Predictability of procedures by governments, and engagement in mechanisms to arbitrate/mediate cross-border differences will help create a "positive sum" environment.

- Globally coherent, interoperable, consensus-based and market-driven International standards for data protection and Internet security are important elements to achieving this goal and optimizing both cross border data flows and effective cross border cooperation and enforcement.

<div align="right">Reported by: Anonymous</div>

Internet and Human Rights

WS20: Launch UNESCO Publication Digital Safety of Journalists

It was widely observed that the issue of digital safety needs more awareness by various stakeholders including journalists themselves. A broad approach should be taken to address the digital security, which combines online and offline threats and involve State and non-state actors. UNESCO is called to continue the exploration of this new area and to further the discussion of this subject in the further IGFs.

<div align="right">Reported by: Xianhong Hu and Guy Berger</div>

WS21: Intermediaries' role and good practice in protecting FOE

Participants acknowledged this is a very timely and useful research to tackle the challenge which goes beyond intermediaries' liability issue. The discussion focused on how to have more transparency reports published and how to go beyond industry dialogue and develop a broader framework.

All the comments received at this meeting will be consolidated into the final research, which will be finalized and published by late 2014. This research will feed into the ongoing UNESCO Comprehensive Study on Internet, and UNESCO also invited participants to join UNESCO multi-stakeholder conference to discuss the first draft of the Study, at UNESCO headquarter in Paris, 3-4 March 2014.

<div align="right">Reported by: Guy Berger, UNESCO</div>

WS56: Researching children's rights in a global, digital age

This was the beginning of a conversation between researchers and research users on the important question of children's rights globally in the digital age. It was judged successful. Follow up actions:

- The general conversation concluded with lots of smaller conversations likely to result in better connections and possible collaboration.

- There is also the possibility of a more coordinated effort to create a clearing house or observatory for research projects, reports and methodologies as they are used around the world. The purpose would be to share resources, encourage best practice, and build capacity.

- There was enthusiasm to continue the conversation at other events, including at next year's IGF. The workshop coordinator will take this forward, with others who express interest.

Reported by: Lelia Green

WS82: Alternative routes protecting human rights on the Internet

- First, the discussion of an international treaty, at least the possibility, is important as past experience (e.g. in copyright) shows;

- Second, parallel Internet or cyber spaces already exist, both from technology and law point of views, whether promoting more spaces is the best way forward needs further reflection and debate;

- Third, it is important to realize and further discuss alternative routes in protecting human rights on the Internet, especially since current routes do not offer satisfactory protection;

- Last, such discussions and debates or explorations need to be encouraged, and the MAPPING project will continue to engage with different stakeholders on these issues.

Reported by: Bo Zhao, University of Groningen

WS83: Human Rights for the Internet: From Principles to Action

Summing up: The session underscored the following points:

1. That the IRPC Charter is a key outcome of the IGF processes of open, cross-sector and inclusive collaborative processes over the long term.

2. Once released as coherent and finished documents in 2010-2011, the IRPC Charter and its 10 IRP Principles have made their mark within the IGF as well as beyond around the world; in terms of education and awareness-raising, frameworks for national and global level Internet governance principles and human rights-based standard-setting for the online environment and for IG decision-making processes should take place in Asia Pacific, Latin America, Europe, and the MENA region.

3. More work needs to be done on articulating more fully the right to remedy, in the Charter itself as well as implementation projects. The knowledge gap about our rights online is closing in some respects but is as large as ever in others, hence the need to continue translations and outreach for the Charter as well as forge ongoing collaborations with all the projects presented above, and emerging initiatives.

Reported by: Marianne Franklin, IRP Coalition

WS91: Launch of an African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedoms

The African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedoms should be promoted in different institutions involved in the dispersed Internet governance field—including Highway Africa, the African Union and UNESCO.

And ongoing advocacy effort is needed to secure endorsements and to build awareness of the Declaration. The Declaration should be used as a resource in the UNESCO Internet study, the Post-2015 Development Agenda and the WSIS +10 process.

Reported by: Dixie Hawtin, Programme Lead Global Partners Digital

WS126: Fostering Respect by Companies for Internet Users' Rights

All panelists have presented their perspectives on the role of companies to protect the rights of Internet users. If on the one hand the panel has looked into this mosaic of initiatives, on the other, it is clear that the way in which different stakeholders interact is fundamental for the success of the presented initiatives as they go beyond the simple analysis of corporate activities.

In this regard, the role of the State was highlighted by many panelists and by the audience, since, after the Snowden revelations and the increasing of the debate around surveillance, there is a growing demand for governmental transparency on the collection and treatment of data, as well as in the procedures for takedown requests.

The panel reinforced the conclusion that the creation of mechanisms that will allow intermediaries to act in a constructive way for the fostering of human rights is key to improving trust across the global Internet.

Reported by: Allon Bar, Ranking Digital Rights

WS132: Online Advocacy and Women Rights: Obstacles and successes

Key take-aways:

- Women are critical to both society and business, and the Internet (and technology generally) can be a great asset for women as parents, as citizens and also as businesspersons.
- Technology and the Internet do not need to be seen as a threat to cultural and societal norms—in fact greater use of technology may enhance opportunities for local culture while also increasing economic growth.
- The Internet has enabled women across the region to improve their businesses in ways they never assumed possible.
- Use of the Internet for business has also helped address social ills like illiteracy.
- Increasing use of the Internet can help address concerns about the depiction of women in advertising and other areas.
- Many more women and men can be brought online for education and business purposes, and it will be crucial to have more women participating at all levels—starting businesses, working online and as participants in policy discussions.
- Food for Thought for IGF 2015:
- WAVE women could organize a follow-on tutorial that discusses "how-tos"—how women became entrepreneurs or hold a Birds of a Feather (BOF).
- A case-study guide could be published online prior to the IGF

- A website could be created to promote the WAVE workshop prior to the IGF and curated by WAVE participants.
- Strong linkages exist with respect to social, cultural and economic growth are key workshop topics, particularly as more and more participants from emerging markets become engaged.

Reported by: Carole Chedid, The Women Alliance for Virtual Exchange

WS146: Anonymity by Design: Protecting While Connecting

There are numerous human rights benefits of anonymity, including enabling other existing rights including freedom of assembly, right to privacy, and freedom of expression.

The importance of open and free social networks for political protest, young people, victims of sexual violence, whistleblowers, and journalists.

Anonymity should be the default and a right for all, not only the rich and powerful.

Anonymity as a right is the responsibility of all stakeholders, users, corporations, and governments.

The technical and legal understanding of anonymity needs to be addressed with more nuance regarding state, law enforcement, and e-commerce practices.

Evidence-based policy reform is needed to protect the right to anonymity online in the use, regulation and governance of the Internet.

Reported by: Robert Bodle, Mount St. Joseph University

WS149: Aligning ICANN Policy with Privacy Rights of Internet Users

ICANN should include data protection commissioners and privacy rights experts in its policy discussions, GAC discussions, and "law enforcement" discussions as part of its policy development process in order to ensure ICANN's policies do not continue to violate the privacy rights of Internet users.

Reported by: Anonymous

WS154: Intelligent Risk management in a mobile online environment

The average age of children going online with mobile devices is decreasing permanently. But research findings indicate that particularly younger children are less familiar with the functionalities and thus are also less skilled to activate the respective privacy setting on their mobile devices to control their own online usage and secure their private data.

We need to think of children's rights from a child perspective. As privacy is a fundamental human right given to children by birth, we will need to ensure that right inures to the benefit of the children. Although the right to privacy is not unconditional, there might be set restrictions in due consideration of the best interest of the child.

- Technical parental controls are supportive, but there is room for improvement, and so far they should not be seen as a stand-alone solution to child online protection.
- Parents and the family as a whole need to be ready for media education, for understanding the children's online usage habits and behaviour, for translation of adults' wisdom from the offline world to online concepts and for a shared beneficial Internet experience.

- Vulnerable children and youths need special attention as they are more likely to be heavy, but unskilled users of social media and social games, thus exposing themselves to potential risks and threats.

- Freedom of access to all information on the Internet is claimed as a natural entitlement by older teenagers.

- Peer education is crucial, and young people need to be trained professionally for that role.

- Intelligent risk management in a mobile online environment does mean shared responsibility of all stakeholders, parents and educators, youths themselves as well as service providers. Intelligent risk management needs to build on each group's strength, encouraging parents and other adults in charge of minors to protect younger children and empower older children and teenagers to cope with potential risks themselves and to educate their peers.

Reported by: Jutta Croll, Zentrum für Kinderschutz im Internet; Johanna Preuß

WS158: Promoting Platform Responsibility For Content Management

Multi-stakeholder cooperation can work in defining roles and responsibility on online content management. It was repeatedly suggested that multi-stakeholder cooperation should be encouraged in order to bridge different communities (across different areas of law) and better involve users into the discussion. One way to tackle this important work is through the Dynamic Coalition on Platform Responsibility that will aim to produce model contractual clauses for online platforms to ensure compliance with human rights. The importance of transparency and of involving users' and civil society in the discussion were recognized as an important components by workshop participants in order to harness the power of multi-stakeholder cooperation, align the behavior of online platforms with users' needs, generate trust and stir market forces in the right direction.

The discussion should start from a recognition of the UN Guiding Principles and the UN "Ruggie framework", and furthered by the development of principles of due diligence, accountability, communication and user empowerment. This discussion might also be facilitated by identifying cases of clearly illegal activity, where the conflict of legitimacy and due process can be solved easily. It was suggested that we can think about due process as a pyramid, which builds in safeguards commensurate to the substantive issues at stake. It was also mentioned that a binary approach (due process vs. online harassment; and free speech vs. online harassment) is simplistic, and can be accommodated by a nuanced definition of protected rights.

One of the issues highlighted for further research concerns the role of financial intermediaries, and the due process guarantees that apply in case of involvement of these entities as part of the strategies of online content management.

Reported by: Anonymous.

WS188: Transparency Reporting as a Tool for Internet Governance

Transparency reporting by both companies and governments is a critical accountability mechanism for Internet governance, one that is quickly growing in popularity. One immediate follow up action was the meeting of the Freedom Online Coalitions (FOC) working group, which met right after the panel, and for which the panel served as a helpful introduction, and it is hoped that the FOC group will work to address one of three major shortcomings in the field—the overall lack of reporting by governments.

There were two other major issues that were raised that indicate possible significant follow-up action. The first was a lack of standardization when it comes to how companies are reporting their data, making it difficult to effectively compare or combine data. This problem is prompting new research into the current methods and best practices of reporting, and the proposal of possible standards that could be shared across companies.

The last major issue raised by many panelists was the lack of reporting by companies about the content takedowns that the companies do voluntarily, based on user complaints or terms-of-service violations, as opposed to government-mandated takedowns. There is definitely room for follow up with the companies and advocacy about this important issue.

Reported by: Danielle Kehl, Open Technology Institute at New America

WS193: The Press Freedom Dimensions of Internet Governance

Both policy changes and technological efforts are necessary to address the protection of journalists and their sources and the protection of communication and information exchange in order to ensure that all actors, both governmental and those in the private sector, respect the rule of law, privacy and free expression and ensure that press freedom is not undermined.

Emerging issues that need to be explored in greater depth are the nexus of surveillance, data retention and anonymity policies and the impact on press freedom, and the emerging challenges that could be posed by the movement towards the Internet of things, and the potential threats to journalistic processes including source confidentiality, disclosure of user data and content data, tracking and the like. Suggestion for this panel to take place again next year and include discussion of these issues and how various stakeholder groups are grappling with them was rasied.

1. There appears to be a growing tendency to take to a greater extreme some of the limitations on press freedom as new technologies emerge, and thus Internet governance discussions need to grapple with the press freedom dimensions of other Internet governance issues like cybersecurity, cybercrime legislation, data retention policies. Policymakers and the broader multi-stakeholder community need to explicitly consider journalists and the impact on press freedom proactively even when it does not appear evident why.

2. Transparency must be the standard for take-down requests, surveillance activities and other processes that impact Internet governance and an open Internet.

3. National legal systems (judiciary, lawyers, etc) need capacity building to help them better understand and grapple with increasingly complex issues related to technology and rights.

Reported by: Anonymous

WS220: Transnational Surveillance and Cross-border Privacy Protections

- Continue to pursue advocacy at international level, to Human Rights Committee and other UN bodies.
- In the light of the success of cases such as Digital Rights (ECJ) and Liberty v. UK (ECHR) in breaking new ground for protecting privacy in surveillance activities, it is important to persist in bringing cases to European and Inter-American courts.
- At national level, it is crucial to increase awareness amongst activists and lawyers of the legal safeguards surveillance practices must adhere to, so that those who facilitate surveillance can be held accountable.
- Private companies should be encouraged to follow best practices.

- Maintain efforts to increase the profile of the Necessary and Proportionate Principles, encouraging governments, organizations and individuals to commit.

Reported by: Katitza Rodriguez, Electronic Frontier Foundation

WS225: Online Freedoms and Access to Information Online

Stakeholders supporting an open Internet should proactively invest in technological fixes that anticipate new threats, rather than responding to the previous ones. However, technological fixes should not be treated as a solution but rather as a way to buy time for policy solutions. Preservation of an open Internet requires a multi-pronged, long-term approach.

Private sector stakeholders that say they are committed to open and free Internet need to provide activists with better access to data so that they can accumulate the evidence they need for informed advocacy and for informed technological development. This includes more detailed and more timely transparency reports, but also should include allowing activists to access more data that can help them develop campaigns and tools.

The current multi-stakeholder approach of the IGF is biased in favor of stronger actors, especially states. States that actively censor speech and imprison activists are allowed to promote themselves as models of ICT development at the IGF, but civil society is not allowed to distribute reports presenting an alternative view of the same states because of the ad hominem principle. In other words, some stakeholders are more equal than others. This is a major problem for multi-stakeholderism. How can the process work if by design states—including those that actively censor speech and punish dissent—are afforded more rights than other stakeholders?

Reported by: Nate Schenkkan, Freedom House; Burcu Bakioglu,
Internet Rights and Principles Coalition

6.1.4. Critical Internet Resources

There was no main session on the sub-theme of critical Internet resources. Of note, however, is the changing, and widening, range of topics that workshops on critical Internet resources discussed at IGF 2014.

Highlights of topics discussed

- ICANN accountability and globalization
- Carrier Grade NAT
- Developing countries participation in global Internet governance
- Internet architecture's role in increasing consumer trust online

Sessions that covered these sub-themes at IGF 2014

The following six workshops focused on issues under the sub-theme of critical Internet resources:

1. WS23: Accountability in Multi-stakeholder Governance Regime ICANN
2. WS44: Improving Internet Architecture to Drive Consumer Trust
3. WS60: Global Access; Connecting the Next Billion Global Citizens
4. WS100: Carrier Grade NAT Impacts on Users, Markets and Cybercrime

5. WS114: Developing Countries Participation in Global IG
6. WS185: ICANN Globalization and the Affirmation of Commitments

Comparison of discussion with previous IGF discussions on the topic

When IGF first began, critical Internet resource discussions focused heavily on Internet name and number resources and the governance systems related to those resources. Over the past few IGFs, however, interest in discussing domain names and IP addresses has diminished significantly to the point that some IGFs have had very little interaction from the floor when critical Internet resources were discussed as main sessions. The removal of a main session dedicated to critical Internet resources at IGF 2014 resulted in a much more diverse range of topical workshops. In particular, the workshops on ICANN's accountability and globalization, were responses to current events and processes in the Internet world, and generated greater interaction between workshop panelists and other participants.

Community suggestions and recommendations on ways forward

Below are the conclusions and suggestions that were developed by workshops on the subthem of critical Internet resources:

WS23: Accountability in Multi-stakeholder Governance Regime ICANN

Panelists and workshop participants agreed to explore the creation of an IGF Dynamic Coalition on the issue of Accountability for Internet Governance Institutions. Those interested in exploring the coalition should contact workshop organizer Robin Gross at robin (at) injustice.org.

Reported by: Anonymous

WS44: Improving Internet Architecture to Drive Consumer Trust

1. We are sharing the one Internet however, we are different organizations, so consumer trust is extremely important, which is the premise of maintaining the stability of the Internet when different organizations, different platform are using the same Internet. However, it is difficult to escape from the conflicts and problems just because of multiple stakeholders. Despite all these, the basic consensus is to foster the trust by both innovated technology and perfected policies. That is why the Internet architecture is always developing and changing faster.

2. Internet is a complicated system but also a balanced system. You push it more strongly; it grows more strongly. The changing environment is not an ideal environment, but no one will have the universal solution to completely solve all problems. There will be no one organization that will say now we figured it out. The governance structure is changing as we are discussing it. But we will go through them, and there will be new governance challenges. And then there will be other solutions that are needed. Therefore, as long as we talk together, as long as we talk to consumers, as long as we understand we have different roles as well, it will be all right.

3. We should adopt the technologies that are being deployed in different layers of the Internet to improve the trust of the users. On the other hand, IGF is very important because it's the place where all the stakeholders meet and we can express our concerns and our views and work with all the other stakeholders to achieve broader consensus and make better policies.

4. The following approach is feasible to continue to both promote capacity building, technical work, and contribute to public policy debate. Also, in that regard, we think that rather than all this talk, we need many brains, just as our SecretaryGeneral says there's not always a monopoly to the solutions. We need to make attempts to establish the multilayer structure of Internet governance, and find out who is the best to implement and who is the best to make the right push.

5. The next actions proposed in the panel is to enhance the dialogue among different stakeholders, especially encourage the developing countries and regions to participate, to emphasize cooperation of capacity-building programmes, to develop the interaction among different regional IGFs in order to boost more understanding and the promotion of new technology.

<div align="right">Reported by: Liyun Han</div>

WS60: Global Access; Connecting the Next Billion Global Citizens

Access is job one for all who are part of the Internet community. While there are plenty of very important issues to discuss in the global Internet policy space, we are mature enough to be able to work on these issues while still driving forward in our campaign to bring access to the next billion global citizens…and the next billion after that…there are challenges in both hemispheres, but through perseverance and learning from our mistakes and embracing best practices, we can reach our goal of bringing every person on the planet broadband access to the Internet. Access empowers everyone.

<div align="right">Reported by: Anonymous</div>

WS100: Carrier Grade NAT Impacts on Users, Markets and Cybercrime

There was near consensus that CGNs are more widely deployed than most people realize. It was also largely agreed that CGNs have significant implications on end users and protocols on the Internet. However, it was also agreed that few users of the Internet realize the implications of deployment of this technology. Those implications were shown to cut across countries and continents—the problems are the same for developed and developing economies. The workshop concluded with a call for further efforts at raising the level of information available about the implications of CGNs.

<div align="right">Reported by: Mark McFadden, InterConnect Communications</div>

WS114: Developing Countries Participation in Global IG

As conclusion, there was a general agreement that outreach should be improved and we need to go beyond that to work more on participation and engagement: lowering the barriers to get more people involved in policy-making process, i.e. in the different supporting organizations, in working groups, etc., it is time for ICANN to listen to the feedback and the comments and improve its own strategies by working, consulting and involving the stakeholders.

It was also highlighted that we need better metrics to assess and evaluate all those initiatives more objectively.

<div align="right">Reported by: Anonymous</div>

WS185: ICANN Globalization and the Affirmation of Commitments

There was agreement that this workshop constituted just the beginning of a much needed discussion, and that there is a pressing need to continue to assess the future of Affirmations of Committments in a globalized institutional environment which includes not only governments but also nongovernmental actors and goes beyond the ICANN community.

Reported by: Anonymous

6.1.5. Emerging Issues

There was no main session on the sub-theme of emerging issues, but the sub-theme was used to enable members of the IGF community to submit workshops on highly topical issues that would not fit under any of the more established IGF sub-themes.

Highlights of topics discussed

- Universal vs a fragmented Internet
- Post-Snowden Internet localization
- Web payment systems
- Crowdsourcing Internet governance ideas
- Building technical communities in developing regions

Sessions that covered these sub-themes at IGF 2014

There were a total of seven workshops on emerging issues:
1. WS61: Policies and Practices to Enable the Internet of Things
2. WS63: Preserving a Universal Internet: The Costs of Fragmentation
3. WS69: The Payment-Privacy-Policing Paradox in Web Payments Systems
4. WS72: Building Technical Communities in Developing Regions
5. WS112: Implications of post-Snowden Internet localization proposals
6. WS142: Emerging Issues from the Arab Internet Community Perspective
7. WS180: Crowd sourced Ideas for IG: NETmundial Brazilian experience

Community suggestions and recommendations on ways forward

WS61: Policies and practices to enable the Internet of Things
Some of the advice provided by the panellist were:
- Improve access to numbering resources.
- Reduce artificial constraints to IoT future growth by guaranteeing sufficient address and identifying spaces.
- Stimulate an open, interoperable and harmonized IoT ecosystem.
- Enhance the trust from users by continuing efforts towards finding solutions to privacy and security concerns.
- Foster clear rules and non-fragmented regulatory frameworks that advance investment and innovation in IoT.

- Disseminate guidelines and IoT best practices to inform policy makers and government agencies.
- Keep capacity building for IoT in developing countries open so as to flexible professionals.
- Promote a global collaboration on resolving IoT challenges.
- Address Internet Governance issues through the lenses of not only how the Internet is today, but how it will be in the future.

Reported by: Lorrayne Porciuncula, OECD

WS63: Preserving a Universal Internet: The Costs of Fragmentation

There are several takeaways from the session. The first takeaway is that the sources of fragmentation are multiple, so a single cause cannot be identified. Each type of fragmentation has multiple contributory causes. Secondly, both costs and benefits accrue during the processes of fragmentation, leading to concerns of net benefits and distributional outcomes. Simply saying that fragmentation is costly is overly simplistic. Finally, efforts at either maintaining a more universal Internet or at implanting various forms of fragmentation often have iatrogenic effects when those measures are scaled upwards. What is individually rational at one level might be collectively disastrous. Moving forward, more research on the conditions under which fragmentation is beneficial or costly would be valuable. A careful mapping of the ways in which the costs and benefits of different forms of fragmentation diffuse would also provide a more nuanced understanding of the issue.

Reported by: Eric Jardine, Caroline Baylon, Samantha Bradshaw

WS69: The Payment-Privacy-Policing Paradox in Web Payments Systems

Collectively the workshop helped to better identify initial boundaries and tensions between individual financial privacy, societal respect and governmental obligations. These valuable insights, well captured in the transcript, are being summarized and analyzed as input into the W3C Technical Plenary meeting in October 27-31, 2014 -- notably before formal commencement of any technical Web Payment standardization work.

As such, we hope to have set a precedent of how difficult technical work, that clearly has deep societal implications, can clearly benefit from dialogue at the IGF.

The main conclusion that should be drawn is that it is indeed possible to explore difficult technical issues and concepts using an interactive role-playing format to help engage and interact.

Care will need to be taken with the scheduling of the IGF and W3C TPAC meetings in 2015 to facilitate further ongoing, mutually beneficial, interaction to minimize the societal risk of unintended consequences of the technology.

With only 118 views, the attempt to innovate and save 24 minutes of briefing time, through the use of pre-meeting youtube videos largely failed. It is unclear whether this was due to miscommunication or mismatched expectations.

Reported by: Pindar Wong, VeriFi

WS112: Implications of Post-Snowden Internet localization Proposals

There clearly is no silver bullet to address concerns of foreign surveillance. Focus on the geographical location of data does not seem to provide satisfactory answers to that issue,

whether from a technical (there are many ways to access the data without users' explicit consent) or a legal perspective (extraterritorial application of laws). Many of the measures that would constrain data within national borders might also generate chilling effects, whether on user choice, users privacy in a domestic context, or in terms of permission-less innovation.

Voluntary measures that add local technical capacity to the network are generally welcome, as they can be beneficial for Internet development. Their impact on reducing surveillance is not conclusive however.

Alternatives to these measures were explored with the panel, including by focusing on encryption of data and reducing the number of parties that can access users' data. It was however felt that an essential pre-requisite should be to build capacity and awareness of end-users, who should be better equipped with an understanding of how and where their personal data is processed.

Reported by: Nicolas Seidler, Internet Society

WS180: Crowd-Sourced Ideas for IG: NETmundial Brazilian Experience

The Brazilian IGF will be a very important opportunity to experience new forms of participation and mobilization. The inspiration on ArenaNETmundial process and its huge public consultation and mobilization will be very important to build inclusive and widespread participation on IG that can contribute with IGF.

Another important follow-up was to closely discuss the south-south cooperation on participation technologies and methodologies that can be built on top of CGI.br's cooperation for multi-stakeholder local governance organisms.

Reported by: Anonymous

The following workshops did not document conclusions or ways forward:
- WS72: Building Technical Communities in Developing Regions
- WS142: Emerging Issues from the Arab Internet Community Perspective

6.2. Focus and Main Sessions

This section summarizes discussion on focus and main sessions that were outside the sub-themes of the IGF 2014.

6.2.1. Network Neutrality: Towards a Common Understanding of a Complex Issue

Highlights of topics discussed

- Differing definitions of what is understand to be "network neutrality"
- Technical, economic and social implications
- Human rights and network neutrality
- Network neutrality from a developmental point of view
- Network neutrality from a regulatory perspective

Sessions that covered these sub-themes at IGF 2014

Main session: Network Neutrality

Going into Istanbul, the following structure was developed to discuss

Network neutrality:

The session would look at a set of agreed policy questions from five different perspectives:

1. Technical perspectives
2. Economic perspectives
3. End-user perspectives
4. Regulatory and legislative perspectives
5. A developmental perspective

It would also look at previous workshops held in the IGF context as well as other international developments which have contributed to the debate:

- The US Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently elaborating rules about the future of the "Open Internet".
- The European Parliament adopted its First Reading of a new Regulation on the Single Telecoms Market enshrining new network neutrality provisions.
- The Council of Europe is working on a draft recommendation by the Committee of Ministers to its 47 member states on protecting and promoting the right to freedom of expression and the right to private life with regard to network neutrality.
- Brazil officially adopted the "Marco Civil" with strong provisions for network neutrality.
- The Dynamic Coalition on Network Neutrality developed its own understanding which fed into a Model Framework on Network Neutrality, initiated by the Council of Europe.

The Session, among other issues, would address the following policy questions:

- How to ensure freedom of expression and other social, economic and cultural rights.
- How to ensure end-to-end consumer choice and unfettered access to the Internet, enabling consumers to access all legal content.
- How to ensure requisite network transparency.
- How to ensure competition among over-the-top providers. This cluster of issues also includes media consolidation and related questions.
- How to define what is considered appropriate network management.

Areas where consensus is emerging

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.**

There was also wide recognition that **network neutrality is a multifaceted issue where technical, economic and social considerations were closely entwined.**

There was a convergence of views on **the importance of enhancing users' experience** or the **need to avoid the blocking of legal content**.

Areas of ongoing debate

There was divergence of views on many issues, particularly on the concept of appropriate network management and the impact on innovation and zero-rating.

The **views of stakeholders from developing and developed countries on network neutrality were particularly divergent**, with the issue of achieving network neutrality being of deepest interest to those from developed countries.

Comparison of discussion with previous IGF discussions on the topic

Network neutrality was the topic of previous workshops at IGF 2013, where a new Dynamic Coalition on Network Neutrality held its inaugural meeting. IGF 2014 is the first IGF to hold a main session devoted to the topic, and therefore reached a much wider range of participants.

Documents or actions that came out of the discussions

As a result of its activities in the lead-up to IGF 2014, the Dynamic Coalition on Network Neutrality produced its second report

Network Neutrality: an Ongoing Regulatory Debate

https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B4CMvT0NORh9RHhKa2IybThhR0U/edit

Community suggestions and recommendations on ways forward

It was noted that the **Dynamic Coalition on Network Neutrality would continue the discussions** leading up to the 2015 meeting.

In addition there was a feeling 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**. It was noted that there was as yet no process within IGF to enable the wider community endorse the outputs of Dynamic Coalitions, which were much smaller subgroups of the larger IGF set of communities.

It was suggested that there was a need to develop a **better understanding of the impact of network neutrality on innovation**.

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

Highlights of topics discussed

- The scope of IANA's functions
- The process to transition stewardship of IANA to the global multi-stakeholder community
- ICANN's accountability to the global community

Overview of the main session

The main session aimed to answer the following questions:

1. Transition of NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Functions:
   - How is the IANA transition discussion evolving?
   - How will the various parties involved in the IANA functions be affected by these proposals?
   - What are the expectations with respect to the timeline and how could the process improve to meet the deadline?

2. Enhancing ICANN Accountability:
   - What are the guiding principles to ensure that the notion of accountability is understood and accepted globally?
   - What features does the community identify as being core to strengthening ICANN's overall accountability in the absence of its historical contractual relationship to the U.S. Government?
   - What are the means by which the global community is assured that ICANN is meeting its accountability commitments?

Comparison of discussion with previous IGF discussions on the topic

IGF 2014 was the first IGF to explicitly include the topic of the IANA functions and ICANN accountability as a focus session. These topics have previously been raised as part of broader discussions on critical Internet resources and multi-stakeholder cooperation.

Community suggestions and recommendations on ways forward

- The process for developing an 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 multi-stakeholder process to develop a new IANA model could build further trust in the multi-stakeholder 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.

6.2.3. Best Practice Forums Wrap-Up

Overview of the main session

The session was an opportunity for the five Best Practice Forum Communities to meet and report on their experiences in developing draft best practice documents.

Participants discussed the use of the term "best practices," noting that it was important for IGF to be careful when developing any best practices to be aware that best practices apply within a particular context and that such practices will need to be continually updated as the Internet evolves.

Community suggestions and recommendations on ways forward

There was agreement amongst the participants that the development of best practices within the IGF process needs to be an **iterative, collaborative process, working for consensus, and not negotiating final outcome text**. All of the Best Practice Forums agreed that attempting to develop detailed solutions would have slowed their progress considerably and perhaps not led to outcomes that were useful to anyone.

There was also agreement about the need to **better engage developing countries in future work** to develop best practices at the IGF.

Participants also agreed that future work needed to **accommodate differences in working methods** and not be strict about trying to apply a uniform process to all Best Practice Forums.

7. Taking Stock of IGF 2015

Following the conclusion of IGF 2014, IGF 2014 participants were requested to complete an online survey to help evaluate the overall meeting. In addition, the IGF Secretariat asked stakeholders to submit written contributions taking stock of the Istanbul meeting and looking forward to the IGF 2015 meeting (tenth IGF). Responses to these two processes were compiled into a synthesis paper[1] that was then discussed at the IGF Open Consultations and MAG Meeting held in December 2014. Below is a summary of feedback received from the community and subsequently discussed as part of the MAG's deliberations.

7.1. General Comments Received

Recognition of the work of the meeting organizers

Many participants thanked the Government of Turkey for the successful hosting of IGF 2014, and in particular, the team from the Information and Communication Technologies Authority (ICTA) of Turkey for their hard work, efficiency and hospitality.

Many also thanked UNDESA and the IGF Secretariat for their operational support, as well as the interpreters and all those who assisted with remote participation, making the IGF an inclusive event.

Appreciation was also extended to the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) for organizing the programme of the IGF and to all those who contributed financial support, directly and indirectly (e.g. through funding participants to come to the IGF).

Other general comments

It was said that the IGF 2014 meeting came at an important time for Internet governance, both internationally and in Turkey, and demonstrated the progress made by the IGF towards becoming more outcome-oriented. It was also mentioned that "there is no other environment like the IGF that allows for fruitful Internet policy discussions without the burdens of negotiated outcomes and political grandstanding".

It was noted in many contributions that the programme development for 2014 was undertaken in an efficient and effective manner, around issues relevant to participants from all stakeholder groups. This development occurred despite a severe constraint on time, with the IGF being held in early September, nearly two months earlier than its usual timing.

Many inputs underlined improvements made in the preparatory processes, such as seeking inputs from all stakeholders on suggested themes and sub-themes prior to the first Open Consultations; combining the Open Consultations with the MAG meeting; holding regular MAG virtual meetings and making the summaries of all meetings available online and

---

[1]   http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/documents/contributions/open-consultations/2014-december/408-synthesis-paper-contributions-taking-stock-of-igf-2014-and-looking-forward-to-igf-2015/file

engaging stakeholders in identifying policy questions to be addressed during IGF main/focus sessions.

It was said that a number of elements distinguished IGF Turkey from other IGFs. These included, but were not limited to:

- The launch of a new funding mechanism to support the IGF (the IGF Support Association).
- The launch of an African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedoms.
- The return of best practices in a new and policy-shaping format.
- Endorsement by participants in a round table of a message that was forwarded to the Human Rights Council Panel on Privacy in the Digital Age.

Stakeholders mentioned many other notable aspects of the IGF 2014 meeting, such as the discussions on:

- ICANN accountability and the IANA stewardship transition
- Reflections on NETmundial
- Increased awareness of human rights, including access, gender and women's rights
- Social media activity

In terms of logistical and organizational aspects, stakeholders emphasized with appreciation that:

- The host country website was informative and covered most of the required practical information.
- Entry visa was is most cases easy to acquire, with straightforward processes.
- The venue was modern, spacious, well equipped, and had various room types.

There were some criticisms on aspects related to the 2014 meeting, as follows:

- Some noted that while the meeting venue was very good in many ways, the multiple-level structure and the location of some of the rooms and other facilities made it less convenient for participants. Room naming and signage could have been clearer.
- Wi-Fi access suffered some disruptions and was of inadequate capacity at times.
- There were some visa issues, which made it difficult for some to attend the IGF in Turkey.
- Criteria for participation in the high level leaders meeting on 'Day 0' were not clear for some.
- One contribution noted that translation and transcribing was below average compared to the Bali IGF
- There could be room for improving the reliability of remote participation
- The opening and closing ceremonies were said to be too long and it was suggested by some to significantly decrease the number of speakers in these sessions

7.2. Comments on Sessions, Participation and Overall Substance of the Ninth IGF

Session topics and format

Some contributions mentioned that the topics of main/focus sessions were well chosen and reflected current high priority issues. Focusing on specific topics brought more value to the sessions and allowed in-depth exchange and understanding of the issues. Moderators of main/focus sessions were engaging and kept the rhythm interesting for the audience. This reflected on the level of attendance in these sessions. The setup and format of main/focus sessions enabled energetic and inclusive discussions. At the same time, it was also mentioned that three-hour slots allocated to some sessions seemed to be somewhat lengthy and sometimes discouraging. It was suggested that keeping sessions' durations below two hours may be desirable. Where a three-hour discussion is needed, a split into two consecutive panels, which are related but distinct, could better serve the purpose. Comments were also made with regard to the fact that some the main/focus sessions had too many panellists/speakers.

One input said that the U-table format for main/focus sessions, with moderators standing and moving between panellists and attendees, was a major improvement and more interactive vis-á- vis IGF 2013. It was said that the reconfiguration of the main room in a U-shape format with seating on three sides was very useful and promoted interactive discussions.

One comment on the 2014 preparatory process noted that progress was made in ensuring that workshop proposals were updated and completed in a timely way, and that the workshop selection process was improved, carried out, and prepared for vigorously. Many lauded the continued evolution of the agenda and the responsiveness to community input.

Some contributions commented that there were too many workshops held in parallel and that some workshops addressed similar topics. It was suggested that the Best Practice Forums should have been held as stand-alone events to allow fuller participation. Others pointed out that main sessions and workshops need to be separated to avoid overlaps which make it difficult for many interested participants to join the sessions which are most important to them.

Many contributions noted their appreciation for the new format and substance of the Chair's Summary. It was also noted that the timely availability of sessions' transcripts and video recordings on the IGF website has magnified the meeting footprint and made it possible for more people to benefit from the knowledge and expertise shared in the sessions.

Many inputs stated that the development of the best practice documents within the framework of the five IGF 2014 Best Practice Forums represents a good step forward in terms of producing more tangible outcomes. It was also said that the process of developing best practices could benefit from more outreach, in order to engage a more diversified experts' pool from the different regions and stakeholder groups. Giving more time to this process and early preparations moving forward will cater for better engagement.

Online participation

In regards to online participation mechanisms, many noted with appreciation that there were multiple ways to participate through WebEx, Twitter, webcasts and YouTube. It was said that it was good to have a variety of ways to participate online, as people were able to follow the sessions from different devices and if there was a problem with one option, another could be used.

The "Sched" online tool used for the IGF 2014 schedule was viewed as an improvement and many onsite and remote participants found it useful in organizing their personalized schedules. Onsite Participants noted that it provided an agile platform to easily plan participation, overview sessions, and better plan side meetings by knowing who is where.

It was suggested that while the IGF remote participation page was useful, a more developed dynamic landing page for all aspects related to remote participation would be ideal. As a practical suggestion, it was mentioned that it would be useful to set WebEx links to open in a new tab, so the IGF website didn't disappear. It was noted also that while those attending the IGF in person are hosted, welcomed and facilitated, this does not really happen for remote participants. Remote participation is a way of increasing the accessibility of the IGF to those who are limited by funding, health or other commitments and how to welcome and include these people should be better considered and formally addressed, with additional funding, if necessary.

It was mentioned that remote participants (RPs), who often form a large percentage of online participants, are not always aware of the possibilities for their interaction. As such, online participation guidelines should be provided not only for moderators and panellists, but also for participants, to help them understand how they can best participate using different tools (webcast, Twitter, WebEx chat, WebEx video intervention, email intervention) and what etiquette should be followed for each type of session. It should be clear what kind of online participation is available for each session (some sessions have online participation facilities, while others, such as side-meetings, do not). Onsite panel organizers and panel moderators do not always know how to manage online participation; guidelines should be provided for them, so they clearly understand their role in supporting participants online.

It was recommended that online moderators should be empowered to insist that RP interventions be considered. One contribution stated:

> "Often remote moderators have a queue of RP interventions, but are not sufficiently recognized by the panel moderator, or are not firm enough in raising the need to attend remote interventions. This point should be addressed in the remote moderator guidelines and respected by panel moderators. The procedure for including remote interventions is not always clear. Panel moderators should be reminded in the guidelines to include instructions to invite both in situ and remote interventions when appropriate during the session. Another 'microphone' should be considered for remote participants, if mics or intervention rotations are given to stakeholder/other groups. The possibility of audio and/or video interventions is not sufficiently promoted or understood and this modality should be better informed in guidelines for RP and RPs, especially for remote hubs, and the newer virtual remote hubs. Panels/workshops/sessions do not realize that there are many RPs following the session, and that they should be acknowledged."

7.3.   December 2014 Open Consultations and MAG Meeting

The first part of the Open Consultations and MAG Meeting was dedicated to taking stock of the IGF 2014 meeting, while setting expectations for IGF 2015. The IGF Secretariat presented a summary of the contributions submitted by stakeholders in advance of the meeting. A number of additional comments were made during the discussions, namely:

a. Appreciation was expressed for the outstanding work done by Turkey, the IGF 2014 Host Country in organizing the meeting.

b. **Participation.** It was noted that the IGF 2014 meeting saw the highest number of participants, with more than 2400 onsite attendees, representing 144 countries (around 74% of all UN membership); nearly 60% of these were coming from developing countries; civil society had the highest representation. This demonstrates that the IGF is continuing to make progress in becoming more inclusive and attracting more participants.

c. **Elements that distinguished IGF 2014 from previous IGFs** were outlined, such as: the Best Practice Forums, the new format and substance of the Chair's Summary, the discussions on network neutrality and on the transitions of the IANA functions among others.

d. **Main/focus sessions.** Some noted that the topics of the main/focus sessions were well chosen and reflected priority issues. It was mentioned that the U-shape format for these sessions and the fact that, in some instances, the moderator moved around the room helped enhancing interaction with the audience. Some comments were made on the fact that the main/focus sessions seemed too long, while others noted that this has not prevented participants' engagement throughout the sessions. It was also mentioned that some sessions had a large number of panelists, and this limited the time allocated for interactions.

e. **Workshops.** It was noted that the workshop evaluation and selection process used for IGF 2014 saw improvements compared to previous years. Appreciation was expressed for the fact that some positive consideration was given to proposals coming from new proponents and from developing countries. Some noted that the large number of workshops held in parallel was a challenge for participants and that, in some instances, workshops focused on similar themes were scheduled at the same time.

f. **Session formats.** IGF 2014 featured a variety of sessions (main/focus sessions, workshops, Dynamic Coalition meetings, open forums, flash sessions and Best Practice Forums). The openness of the IGF Secretariat to accept a certain number of parallel sessions, such as side-events, was noted with appreciation, and it was mentioned that this approach helped broadening participation and better integrating participants. Some concerns were raised concerning the planning of the Day 0.

g. **Logistics.** It was noted that the IGF 2014 venue was modern and spacious; more efforts could have been done to improve room signage. The "Sched" tool used for the IGF 2014 schedule was again mentioned as a laudable improvement. Appreciation was expressed for the timely availability of sessions' transcripts and video recordings on the IGF website, as well as for the multiple ways to remotely participate through WebEx, Twitter, webcasts and YouTube. It was noted that Wi-Fi capacity was limited, especially during the first two days of the meeting.

It was concluded that the overall assessment of the IGF 2014 meeting was very positive and that the MAG and the entire IGF community needs to continue working and advancing in the same direction and with the same approach, under the guidance of the recommendations of the CSTD Working Group on Improvements to the IGF.

CONNECTING CONTINENTS FOR ENHANCED MULTISTAKEHOLDER INTERNET GOVERNANCE

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 organizations, private sector, civil society and technical community) participated in this annual international gathering exclusively devoted to Internet governance.

2014 was an extremely pivotal and important year for the future of international Internet and Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) policy and the 9th IGF played a key role in facilitating timely policy debates and identifying emerging issues for further discussion on topics such as Net Neutrality; the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) stewardship transition and pressing questions about Human Rights online, among many others.

Each year, the IGF Secretariat produces a wide-ranging summary of the proceedings that take place at the annual global IGF gatherings. Included herewith are reports with conclusions and outcomes of more than 100 expert-led discussions and debates and edited transcripts of all the main sessions.

To ensure full transparency, the IGF Secretariat and the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs invite all interested stakeholders to visit the IGF website (*www.intgovforum.org*) for more information on the proceedings from Istanbul, future IGF meetings, news and events.

9 789211 232028