

# **The Internet Governance Forum (IGF)**

## **Third Meeting**

Hyderabad, 3-6 December 2008

## Synthesis Paper

Prepared by the IGF Secretariat

## Table of Contents

I. Introduction .....	3
II. The Role and Functioning of the IGF .....	4
A. General Comments.....	4
B. The Annual Meeting.....	5
C. The Multistakeholder Advisory Group.....	5
III. The Substantive Agenda of the Hyderabad Meeting .....	5
A. General Comments.....	5
B. Reaching the Next Billion.....	6
C. Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust .....	7
D. Managing Critical Internet Resources .....	9
E. Emerging Issues: The Internet of Tomorrow- Innovation and the Evolution of the Internet .....	10
IV. The Way Forward .....	11
Annex I: List of Submissions.....	13
Annex II: Glossary of Internet Governance Terms .....	14

## I. Introduction

1. This background paper is conceived as an input into the discussions of the third IGF meeting, to be held in Hyderabad, India, on 3 – 6 December 2008. It summarizes the 15 submissions that were received prior to 12 September 2008 the deadline set for sending in contributions. It also draws on earlier contributions and papers and the interventions made during these consultations, including those made through remote participation. This paper does not necessarily cover every argument in every submission; all the submissions can be found, in full, on the IGF Web site: <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php/contributions>. The transcripts of the consultation meetings are also available, in full, on the IGF Web site. These materials should be consulted for the full discussion presented by those who made the contributions. An abstraction such as this synthesis can never do justice to the wealth of content of these contributions.
2. The inaugural meeting of the IGF was held in Athens, on 30 October – 2 November 2006, and the second meeting was held in Rio de Janeiro on 12-15 November 2008. As a follow-up to that meeting, the Secretariat issued a call for contributions on the IGF Web site with the aim to take stock of the Rio de Janeiro meeting, assess what worked well and what worked less well and make suggestions with regard to the preparation of the meeting in Hyderabad.
3. As a first step for preparing the Hyderabad meeting, a stock taking session took place on 26 February 2008. A synthesis paper<sup>1</sup> was produced as an input into the February meeting. The paper addressed both the things that worked well and those that worked less well in the second meeting of the IGF.
4. The preparatory process for the third meeting of the IGF was conducted in an open, inclusive and transparent manner. Three rounds of public consultations, open to all stakeholders, were held in Geneva on 26 February, on 13 May and on 16 September. From these consultations emerged a draft programme and schedule for the second meeting of the IGF. The consultations allowed all stakeholders, including individual participants with proven expertise and experience, to take part on an equal footing.
5. As with the first and second years, there was a general view that the IGF needed to maintain an overall development orientation. Capacity building was the most frequently mentioned issue in the public consultations and was also referred to in several of the contributions. Another frequently mentioned theme was rights and the internet. These themes were presented not only in terms of the growing consensus for their priority in enabling meaningful participation but also as a specific policy issues. When looking at capacity building, it was pointed out that access to education and knowledge was a recognized human right. The necessity of fostering the ability of all stakeholders from all countries to participate in the process of Internet governance was also pointed out. It was suggested that explicit actions should be taken to explore the offering of relevant Internet governance educational resources online. When looking at rights, the primary concerns were on privacy and the right to knowledge.
6. The invitation to attend the third IGF meeting, to be held in Hyderabad, was issued by United Nations Under-Secretary-General Sha Zukang on 24 July 2008. The invitation contained the agenda of the meeting which will focus on three main themes, with two sub themes for each of the main themes, and will also include a session on emerging issues. The agenda is as follows:

- Reaching the Next Billion
  - Access
  - Multilingualism
- Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust

---

1 Available on the IGF Web site

- Dimensions of cyber-security and cyber-crime
- Fostering security, privacy and openness
- Managing Critical Internet Resources
  - Transition from IPv4 to IPv6
  - Global, regional and national arrangements
- Emerging issues: The Internet of tomorrow - Innovation and the evolution of the Internet
- Taking Stock and the Way forward.

7. On 22 August 2008 the mandate of the Advisory Group was renewed. The UN Secretary-General's Special Adviser for Internet Governance, Nitin Desai, was reappointed as chair of the Advisory Group. The 50 members of the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group serve in their personal capacity. They have been chosen from governments, the private sector and civil society, including the academic and technical communities, from all regions.

## II. The Role and Functioning of the IGF

### A. General Comments

8. The role and functioning of the IGF was debated in several of the submissions and commented on by many speakers. While different opinions were expressed as to how its mandate should be implemented, most contributions and statements underlined the unique, if not experimental, character of the IGF as a platform for multi-stakeholder dialogue and co-operation. One speaker<sup>2</sup> praised the IGF for the innovative approach of discussions among equals that allowed a “dynamic and collaborative experience”.

9. There was strong support for the multi-stakeholder principle. Many contributions and speakers<sup>3</sup> discussed the importance of the multi-stakeholder nature of the IGF, and emphasized the continued importance of stakeholders participating on an equal footing. The multi-stakeholder approach was described as the baseline for the IGF<sup>4</sup>.

10. Several comments were made<sup>5</sup> on the causes for the IGF's success to date and the view was held that this was because it did not attempt to make decisions, but rather allowed for open discussion by all stakeholders in an open atmosphere.

11. There was some discussion<sup>6</sup> of the examination called for by the Tunis Agenda on the “... desirability of the continuation of the Forum in consultation with Forum participants within five years of its creation ...”.

12. It was noted that it would be important to reach out to constituencies that are still not heavily involved in the IGF, especially constituencies from developing countries.

13. While many welcomed the suggestion to have an external evaluation made of the IGF, others urged caution. If such an evaluation were necessary, then it should be done in an open and transparent manner using experts who have adequate expertise in global public policy and policy institutions.

14. It was recommended that the process start as soon as possible, preferably during the Hyderabad meeting. It was also suggested that the workshop held in 2007 and one to be held in 2008 on the “role and mandate” of the IGF could contribute towards this process.

---

2 ISOC

3 e.g., ICC/BASIS, Nippon Keidanren, GIIC

4 United States of America, ITAA, WITSA

5 e.g. ITAA, Nippon Keidanren

6 e.g. IGC

15. Several substantive comments were also made on the IGF mandate, role and structure. It was stressed that it remained important for the IGF to address all issues related to Internet governance, no matter how controversial.
16. The importance of the regional and national IGF processes that have been developing was also emphasized.
17. The call was made for the IGF to delve more deeply into substantive issues. This was accompanied by a recommendation for substantive inter-sessional work in addition to the work currently being done to plan the annual meeting.
18. One contribution<sup>7</sup> went into a detailed appraisal of the successes and failures of the IGF so far. It stated that the IGF has been a success to the extent to which it fulfilled a vacuum that existed within Internet governance for a multi-stakeholder forum to address Internet-related public policy issues. At the same time, it held the view that the IGF has been a failure to the extent that critical Internet-related public policy issues are still addressed in primarily an ad-hoc manner. It also made recommendations for reforming the IGF processes and structure.
19. The hope was expressed that African civil society could have a substantial role in organizing the IGF to be held in Egypt in 2009.<sup>8</sup> Among the other recommendations made in the same submission was a call for a multilingual IGF Web site to support a multilingual IGF, the establishment of thematic working groups, and the production of publications detailing the results and experiences of the IGF.
20. During the course of the year, several interventions recommended greater transparency in the planning and preparatory process of the IGF meeting with regard to meetings of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG). There was broad support of providing adequate resources for greater online and remote participation, including discussion and deliberation.
21. The need for stable funding was discussed frequently during the year and in some of the contributions<sup>9</sup>. The funding discussed was not only to enable the appropriate and streamlined function of an IGF Secretariat, but also to enable “equity in participation in the IGF across geography and social groups.”

## **B. The Annual Meeting**

22. One contribution<sup>10</sup> recommended that, guided by paragraph 72g of the Tunis Agenda for Information Society, the Forum release concrete recommendations relating to the main areas covered by the annual meeting.

## **C. The Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG)**

23. The point was made<sup>11</sup> that in order for the IGF to realize its full potential, it was critical to ensure that all stakeholders from the Internet community continue to participate in the event and its planning. Also, it was considered important to maintain an effective Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) to act as a program committee and to offer input as to discussion, topics, and speakers.
24. One contribution<sup>12</sup> pointed out that the MAG should be involved with the working groups that were suggested in several contributions.

---

7 Jeremy Malcolm

8 ACSIS

9 e.g. IGC,

10 Russian Federation

11 United States of America

12 IGC

### **III. The Substantive Agenda of the Hyderabad Meeting**

#### **A. General Comments**

25. One contribution<sup>13</sup> reiterated its full support of the WSIS Tunis conclusion that the IGF “would be constituted as a neutral, non-duplicative, and non-binding process.”

26. It was pointed out<sup>14</sup> that attendance and participation in the IGF should continue to be open to a broad array of stakeholders, including governments, business entities, civil society, scientists and inter-governmental organizations.

27. Several of the comments received during the course of the year discussed the ways in which Internet governance mechanisms could only be understood in a broader set of issues and within international and national policy frameworks.

28. One contribution<sup>15</sup> stated “the overall IGF theme of an “Internet for all”, together with the sub-themes “reaching the next billion”, “promoting cyber-security and trust” and “fostering security, privacy and openness”, was based on the underlying belief that the Internet had the potential to improve our quality of life. It contributed to the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, and was linked to “the prospects of economic and social development and the promotion of the values of the preservation of human society and civilization, and the belief in individual freedom, political liberty and the rule of law which form the basis of all genuine democracies”.

29. Several contributions<sup>16</sup> expressed the view that Internet governance should be governed in all respects by human rights, particularly the freedom of expression.

30. One contribution<sup>17</sup>, while praising the selection of “Internet for all” as the overall theme, discussed a concern that this theme was being celebrated in terms of a simplistic understanding and was being used to point to the adequacy of the market as a provider of equal Internet opportunity. The discussion pointed to the relationship between the theme of “Internet for all” and the UNESCO theme “education for all” which was “an expression of the right to education contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” This contribution focused on the importance of understanding Internet governance within the context of rights. It discussed several principles including the identification of a right, for example the freedom of expression, as subsuming commercial logics and the mandates of the right to the Internet for all.

31. It was cautioned against holding plenary sessions on the same topics from year to year, with a contributor suggesting that these sessions should be reserved for discussion of cross-cutting areas and emerging issues.<sup>18</sup>

32. One contribution, *Imagining the Internet - Rio Internet Policy survey*, provided a compendium of survey data on the view of participants in the 2007 IGF meeting.

#### **B. Reaching the Next Billion**

33. Several contributions<sup>19</sup> called for the inclusion of sustainable development to be treated as a key theme in Hyderabad. Sustainable development was seen by these contributors as critical to many core IGF themes, for example the access theme. As a theme of global concern, it was described as an appropriate topic for the IGF.

34. The example of the relevance of sustainable development in terms of the access theme was underlined<sup>20</sup>. It was pointed out that the decisions made by policy makers on how to expand infrastructure to reach the next billion have long term implications on the environment, and that

---

13 United States of America

14 United States of America

15 Council of Europe (COE)

16 Association for Progressive Communications (APC), Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus (IGC), CoE

17 IT for Change

18 Association for Progressive Communications (APC)

19 International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), APC, GILC

20 APC

these implications for climate affect the sustainability of the infrastructure itself.

35. One contribution<sup>21</sup> went into a specific discussion of “Green ICT” and juxtaposed the realization that the environmental impact of ICT industry needed to be considered and the contribution that this same ICT industry could make in lowering the environmental impact of other industries, e.g. in monitoring, measuring and addressing climate change, and enabling behavioural and economic changes to reduce industrial carbon demand. This contribution discussed the Tokyo Declaration which contained recommendations including the following:

- Lowering the environmental impact of ICT by lowering electricity consumption of ICT and by combating spam, which can utilize as much as 25% of server capacity;
- Lowering environmental impact by using ICT to measure and monitor compliance and promoting new business practices; and
- Achieving the goal of mitigating the challenges of climate change by enabling exchange of information and development of a roadmap for change, while developing market based approaches to reduce greenhouse gasses and enabling early action.

36. One contribution<sup>22</sup> described the importance of education for developing economies in enabling access and enlightening users on how to utilize the Internet appropriately. They went on to indicate that developed countries should contribute more in terms of human resource development by providing educational materials and technical know-how.

37. The importance of focusing on governance issues in the developing world, especially in Africa, was emphasized<sup>23</sup>.

38. One contributor<sup>24</sup> spoke about the important role developed nations had to play in supporting improved Internet access in the developing countries with specific reference to the creation of an environment where international private sector investment was able to contribute to the building of a developing country's infrastructure.

39. One suggestion<sup>25</sup> was to establish seed funding, training and incubator services to stimulate development of local content production and online services for the local market. This could be done through government or business initiatives

40. Access was seen as “vital to empowering more business and individuals to take advantage of the powerful resource that the Internet represents”<sup>26</sup>. The contribution went on to support an enabling regulatory environment at the national level to foster development, growth and the establishment of Internet exchange points (IXP).

41. The importance of national policies with regard to the promotion and protection of investment was emphasized<sup>27</sup>. The view was held that “suitable conditions” would allow the private sector to “undertake the necessary risks to invest in infrastructure and ICT, within a competitive environment.” Appropriate policies thus fostered the growth of the Internet.

42. Many contributions<sup>28</sup>, written and oral, spoke of the importance of multilingual development, both in Internationalised Domain Names (IDN) and software applications for reaching diversified cultures. One contribution<sup>29</sup> went on to discuss the creation of business models that “enable these countries to achieve self-sustaining economic development that makes use of their language and culture.”

---

21 GIIC

22 Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC), Nippon Keidanren

23 African Civil Society for the Information Society (ACSIS)

24 Nippon Keidanren

25 International Chamber of Commerce/Business Action to Support the Information Society (ICC/BASIS)

26 World Information Technology and Services Alliance (WITSA)

27 ETNO

28 e.g., GIIC, Nippon Keidanren, WITSA, European Telecommunications Network Operators Association (ETNO)

29 Nippon Keidanren

43. The point<sup>30</sup> was emphasized that access to the Internet was important in its own right to people with disabilities and those who are otherwise disadvantaged, such as minorities and the elderly, by providing services that improve their lives and help to make those lives more fulfilling. Some of the examples provided include secured electronic voting, distance learning opportunities, and the Internet as a platform for greater dialogue - to encourage tolerance, mutual co-operation and social cohesion. Among the important considerations is to use universal design principles in designing future applications to be useable by those who are disabled or otherwise disadvantaged.

### C. Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust

44. A view was expressed that the threats to information security included cyber-crime, use of the Internet for terrorist purposes, including cyber-terrorism, and use of the ICT for purposes inconsistent with ensuring international stability and security.<sup>31</sup> It was stated that development of common definitions in the sphere of information security and harmonization of national legislations would considerably simplify elaboration of corresponding international agreements and contribute to the development of the international legal framework in the area.

45. A few contributions<sup>32</sup> pointed out that a secure and reliable Internet would enable greater use and trust of the Internet throughout the world.

46. User awareness<sup>33</sup> was seen as one of the critical elements in achieving a secure Internet. Contributions<sup>34</sup> went on to discuss the fact that national and regional efforts could not respond to all threats given the trans-border nature of the Internet and that solutions often involved global public-private co-operation. Several contributions wrote of the importance of Computer Security Incident Response Teams (CSIRT) as part of the effective framework against current and future threats. Education was seen as another key part of security for developing economies, and it was recommended that developed countries consider providing assistance in this respect.

47. Several contributions wrote of the importance of open access to the Internet, freedom of expression and access to knowledge. One contribution<sup>35</sup> pointed out the need to strike a balance between government regulation and private self-regulation in order to combat harmful content on the Internet while promoting freedom of expression. This contribution also wrote of the need to establish a new balance between copyright protection and 'practical use' of content in order to foster new and creative endeavours.

48. The theme of the IGF – 'Internet for all' - was described as a legitimate aspiration<sup>36</sup> linked to the prospects of development and democratic citizenship that should go hand in hand with a maximum of rights and services subject to a minimum of restrictions and a level of security that users were entitled to expect. Freedom of expression and information regardless of frontiers was seen as overarching requirement.

49. One contribution<sup>37</sup> called for establishing common international criteria for cyber-crimes, such as copyright and privacy infringements, spamming, and child pornography, while respecting the cultures and customs of diverse countries.

50. One set of remarks<sup>38</sup> discussed the view that cyber-crime posed challenges to all stakeholders, and that cyber-security involved all stakeholders. The contribution noted that there were important and effective policy and regulatory approaches as well as technical fixes, good practices and helpful initiatives.

---

30 CoE

31 Russian Federation

32 Global Information Infrastructure Commission (GIIC), COE, WITSA

33 GIIC

34 GIIC, Nippon Keidanren

35 GIIC

36 World Information Technology and Services Alliance (WITSA)

37 Nippon Keidanren

38 ICC/BASIS



51. A blueprint in the form of principles and guidelines agreed to by the 47 member states of the Council of Europe, was provided for IGF multistakeholder discussions for openness, security and privacy within a human rights framework<sup>39</sup>. This blueprint included recommendations to:

- “Implement a common criminal policy aimed at the protection of society against cyber-crime, to co-operate for the purposes of investigations or proceedings concerning criminal offences related to computer systems and data, or for the collection of evidence in electronic form of a criminal offence, and to resolve jurisdictional problems in cases of crimes committed in other state parties to the Cyber-crime convention”;
- “Enhance network and information security to enable them to resist actions that compromise their stability as well as the availability, authenticity, integrity and confidentiality of stored or transmitted data and the related services offered by or accessible via these networks and systems”;
- “Empower stakeholders to protect network and information security”;
- “Adopt legislation and establishing appropriate enforcement authorities, where necessary, to combat spam. Member states should also facilitate the development of appropriate technical solutions related to combating spam, improve education and awareness among all stakeholders and encourage industry-driven initiatives, as well as engage in cross-border spam enforcement co-operation”;
- “Encourage the development of common rules on the co-operation between providers of information society services and law enforcement authorities ensuring that such co-operation has a clear legal basis and respects privacy regulations”;
- “Protect personal data and privacy on the Internet and other ICTs”;
- “Combat piracy in the field of copyright and neighbouring rights”;
- “Work together with the business sector and consumer representatives to ensure e-commerce users are afforded transparent and effective consumer protection that is not less than the level of protection afforded in other forms of commerce”;
- “Promote the safer use of the Internet and of ICTs, particularly for children”;
- “Promote the active participation of the public in using, and contributing content to, the Internet and other ICTs”;
- “Promote freedom of communication and creation on the Internet, regardless of frontiers”;  
and,
- “Promote public domain information accessibility via the Internet, which includes government documents, allowing all persons to participate in the process of government; information about personal data retained by public entities; scientific and historical data; information on the state of technology, allowing the public to consider how the information society might guard against information warfare and other threats to human rights; creative works that are part of a shared cultural base, allowing persons to participate actively in their community and cultural history.”

52. The same blueprint also included specific recommendations in regards to the following issue areas:

- Human rights guidelines for Internet service providers (ISP);
- Human rights guidelines for online games providers;
- Protecting children's dignity, security and privacy in the Internet;
- Meeting the challenge of cyber-crime;
- Countering terrorist use of the Internet; and

---

39 COE

- Consumer protections from counterfeit medicines and medical devices.

53. A concern was mentioned that rights might be lost as a focus of the IGF and that the theme should not be subordinated to the theme of security.<sup>40</sup>

#### **D. Managing Critical Internet Resources**

54. One contribution<sup>41</sup> highlighted the importance of the management of the domain names system, Internet protocol addresses and root servers and the internationalisation of the use of the Internet. The contribution went on to discuss that it was necessary to find a solution under which Internet governance would be carried out in accordance with the WSIS principles that state that organization of the Internet use at the international level should be multilateral, transparent and democratic with all-round involvement of governments, private sector, civil society and international organizations. The contribution indicated that Internet governance should guarantee fair distribution of resources, facilitate ubiquitous access and ensure sustained and secure functioning of the Internet with due allowance for multilingualism. It went on to state that according to the WSIS principles no country's government should play a dominant role in the international management of the Internet.

55. Several contributions warned against any sudden introductions of an intergovernmental governance system. One contribution<sup>42</sup> pointed out that the Internet had securely and flexibly evolved and that it functioned well under the current governance structure. This contribution went on to point out that while dialogue within the IGF on governance of critical Internet resources was welcomed, especially on topics of neutrality and transparency, the Tunis Agenda was specific about the IGF having no oversight function.

56. Another contribution<sup>43</sup> stated that an international body led by governments would not allow for the rapid decision-making that was necessary in the Internet.

57. There was support<sup>44</sup> of the largely unregulated environment that allowed the Internet to grow. A contribution indicated that the Internet had been able to thrive in a wide variety of market environments under competitive conditions and argued that the Internet should remain free of centralized and heavy regulation. This contribution supported "private sector initiatives to develop and deliver market based solutions to the challenges faced by the Internet and its users."

58. The use of dual IPv4/IPv6 protocol stacks and a stronger focus on developed countries taking an initiative in promoting the use of IPv6 address, as a response to the limited availability of IPv4 addresses, was recommended.<sup>45</sup>

59. One contribution<sup>46</sup> described additional issues that should be discussed under the theme of critical Internet resources, including:

- Digital Object Identifiers (DOI),
- ENUM (Electronic Numbering),
- Radio spectrum, backbone, and Internet Service Providers (ISPs), and
- Regional Management activities such as Regional Internet Registries (RIRs).

60. While recognising the importance of IPv6, one contribution<sup>47</sup> indicated that it would only be adopted when the industry determined that the required drivers are in place.

#### **E. Emerging Issues: The Internet of Tomorrow - Innovation and the Evolution of the**

---

40 Dynamic Coalition on the Internet Bill of Rights, APC, IGC

41 Russian Federation

42 GIIC

43 Nippon Keidanren

44 World Information Technology and Services Alliance (WITSA)

45 Nippon Keidanren

46 ICC/BASIS

47 ETNO

## Internet

61. The digital convergence of information formats, service, networks and business models was the subject of one contribution<sup>48</sup> which highlighted the benefits of the network convergence movement over the last ten years. Increased market access and competitiveness were described as important elements for creating greater efficiency and scope of sales and service. The contribution urged governments to work in partnership with businesses to create policy frameworks to ensure that obstacles to converged business models were removed. It was stressed that any government regulations should only be undertaken after consultation with stakeholders in order to ensure the proportionality of the regulation. The use of competition law as the predominant means of preventing the abuse of market power was also promoted. In consideration of the borderless nature of the Internet, the contribution emphasized that there was a particular need to avoid divergent approaches between countries or regions, as this could result in barriers for convergence, the off-shoring of investments to more favourable regulatory climates or, at worse, the splitting up of the Internet.

62. It was suggested<sup>49</sup> that business leaders could make an important contribution by familiarizing all stakeholders about the realities that confront businesses when they consider “whether to expend financial, human and technological resources in the development and deployment of ICT capabilities.”

63. “Rights and the Internet” was recommended<sup>50</sup> as the overarching theme for the fourth IGF meeting. It was purposed that the theme could evolve out of the workshops being held in Hyderabad. The purpose of this theme would be to clarify and attempt to reach consensus on how rights with respect to the Internet were defined, and how they relate to pre-existing definitions of human rights and which ones needed to be internationally recognized and strengthened. The contribution suggested several areas that could benefit from discussion:

- The role of the right to development in terms of bridging the digital divide and what does this right mean in terms of redress of widening economic, political and social divides.
- Privacy rights and the ability of corporations and governments to increasingly extend digital information gathering into people's homes and personal mobile devices.
- Consumer rights in terms of the ownership of products and services that the consumers buy.
- Issues concerning the public interest principles that underpin intellectual property and the right to knowledge.
- The right to freedom of information and the threats that have emerged.

64. One contribution<sup>51</sup> discussed issues related to problems associated with the environment in the context of emerging issues and recommended that at the next IGF, the theme “Internet and Environmental Problems”<sup>52</sup> be explored. This contribution also discussed the spread of a model of electronic governance within corporate, government and regional administrative operations as a way to conserve resources. Several contributions<sup>53</sup> discussed sustainable development as an emerging issue while others discussed it in the context of Reaching the Next Billion.

65. It was suggested<sup>54</sup> exploring several areas under the topic of emerging issues dealing with innovation and the evolution of the Internet. This could include exploring the risk that regulation might hamper the innovation and competition that drive the evolution of the Internet.

66. The same submission proposed to discuss innovation in the area of interoperability and

---

48 ICC/BASIS

49 GIIC

50 Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus (IGC), It for Change

51 Nippon Keidanren

52 Nippon Keidanren

53 e.g. WITSA

54 ICC/BASIS

how intellectual property protection was necessary to encourage IPR holders to contribute cutting edge technologies towards standardization. It was also stressed that innovation in voluntary industry collaboration and tools was necessary to allow interoperability in an increasingly complex and diverse environment.

67. The contribution also included the following suggestions:

- The role of innovation and how it contributes to the Internet and its applications;
- Creating an enabling environment for innovation;
- Innovation and bridging the digital divide;
- Innovation and SMEs; and,
- Consumers and their impact on creating demand for innovation.

68. Other emerging issues presented in one contribution<sup>55</sup> included:

- “Importance of ensuring and leveraging innovation and creativity, including in non-traditional arenas,”
- “Impact of the changes of the Internet that will be driven by the massive increase in the role of wireless on mobile users,” and
- “Opportunities and challenges of social networking applications and emerging innovations as applications.”

#### **IV. The Way Forward**

69. Some of the contributions<sup>56</sup> recommended that working groups be formed to assist in ensuring that the primary IGF themes, cross-cutting areas, and topics be addressed as effectively as possible before, during and after the annual IGF meeting. The recommendations for working groups included:

- Using them to synthesize outcomes of relevant workshops, best practice forums and plenary sessions and make suggestions to various stakeholders on ways to move from dialogue to action;
- Using them to help in defining issues such as the development agenda for Internet governance; and
- Using them to help in addressing the cross-cutting issues.

70. There were several comments<sup>57</sup> recommending regional and national IGF events and praising the efforts that have gone into creating these events.

71. One contribution<sup>58</sup> recommended that the IGF continue to facilitate dialogue and not engage in negotiation of formal documents and outcomes. This contribution also supported the importance of the IGF's focus on engagement with developing countries and calls on all participants to continue to work together:

- “To keep the Internet open and accessible to all of society”;
- “To ensure reliable and secure access to information and communications networks and services”;
- “To recognize the multistakeholder nature of Internet Governance and to strengthen and broaden involvement and leadership of industry in relevant forums”;

---

55 WITSA

56 Association for Progressive Communications (APC), IGC

57 e.g. APC, IGC

58 WITSA

- “To promote the transition from the current Internet addressing system (IPv4) to an addressing system capable of supporting continued Internet expansion and new applications for the foreseeable future (IPv6)”;
- “To ensure that global public policy and governing national systems enable to use of ICT products and services through societies.”

72. There was a general understanding that it would be necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the functioning of the IGF as well as the role, function and composition of the Advisory Group in a follow-on session early in 2009 as part of the overall assessment of the achievements of the Hyderabad meeting.

73. One contribution<sup>59</sup> suggested the creation of a system for communicating results. The suggestion indicated that especially the work of the dynamic coalitions and the best practice forums should be shared with a group that is broader than the participants of the IGF. The contribution went on to suggest that the IGF “should develop into a pioneering meeting by reflecting the Internet age. Enabling multi-stakeholders to freely participate would allow a diverse range of opinions from a diverse range of participants to be heard. The IGF could then summarize debates and strengthen the spread of its message.”

---

59 Nippon Keidanren

## **List of Submissions**

1. Russian Federation
2. United States of America
3. African Civil Society for the Information Society (ACIS)
4. Association for Progressive Communications (APC)
5. Council of Europe - Internet, a critical resource for all
6. GIIC's Perspective on Internet Governance and the IGF Hyderabad 2008
7. Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus (IGC): Rights and the Internet as the overarching theme for IGF-4 in Egypt
8. Civil Society Internet Governance Caucus (IGC): Review and mandate of the IGF
9. International Chamber of Commerce / Business Action to Support the Information Society (ICC/BASIS)
10. IT for Change: 'Internet for All' Implies a Rights-based Approach to Internet Governance
11. Imagining the Internet IGF-Rio Internet Policy Survey
12. Nippon Keidanren (Japan Business Federation) 3rd IGF Position Paper
13. WITSA input to IGF 2008 in Hyderabad
14. Jeremy Malcolm: Appraising the Success of the Internet Governance Forum
15. Dynamic Coalition on the Internet Bill of Rights

## Annex II: Glossary of Internet Governance Terms

<b>AfriNIC</b>	Regional Registry for Internet Number Resources for Africa (Member of NRO)
<b>APC</b>	Association for Progressive Communication
<b>ASCII</b>	American Standard Code for Information Interchange; seven-bit encoding of the Roman alphabet
<b>ccTLD</b>	Country code top-level domain, such as .gr (Greece), .br (Brazil) or .in (India)
<b>CoE</b>	Council of Europe
<b>CSIRTs</b>	Computer Security Incident Response Teams
<b>DNS</b>	Domain name system: translates domain names into IP addresses
<b>DRM</b>	Digital Rights Management
<b>DOI</b>	Digital Object Identifier
<b>ETNO</b>	European Telecommunications Networks Operators Association
<b>F/OSS</b>	Free and Open Source Software
<b>GAC</b>	Governmental Advisory Committee (to ICANN)
<b>gTLD</b>	Generic top-level domain, such as .com, .int, .net, .org, .info
<b>IANA</b>	Internet Assigned Numbers Authority
<b>ICANN</b>	Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
<b>ICC</b>	International Chamber of Commerce
<b>ICC/BASIS</b>	ICC Business Action to Support the Information Society.
<b>ICT</b>	Information and communication technology
<b>ICT4D</b>	Information and communication technology for development
<b>IDN</b>	Internationalized domain names: Web addresses using a non-ASCII character set
<b>IETF</b>	Internet Engineering Task Force
<b>IGF</b>	Internet Governance Forum
<b>IGOs</b>	Intergovernmental organizations
<b>IP</b>	Internet Protocol
<b>IP Address</b>	Internet Protocol address: a unique identifier corresponding to each computer or device on an IP network. Currently there are two types of IP

addresses in active use. IP version 4 (IPv4) and IP version 6 (IPv6). IPv4 (which uses 32 bit numbers) has been used since 1983 and is still the most commonly used version. Deployment of the IPv6 protocol began in 1999. IPv6 addresses are 128-bit numbers.

<b>IPRs</b>	Intellectual property rights
<b>IPv4</b>	Version 4 of the Internet Protocol
<b>IPv6</b>	Version 6 of the Internet Protocol
<b>IRA</b>	International Reference Alphabet
<b>ISOC</b>	Internet Society
<b>ISP</b>	Internet Service Provider
<b>ITAA</b>	Information Technology Association of America
<b>ITU</b>	International Telecommunication Union
<b>IXPs</b>	Internet exchange points
<b>LACNIC</b>	Latin American and Caribbean Internet Addresses Registry (Member of NRO)
<b>MAG</b>	Multistakeholder Advisory Group
<b>MDGs</b>	Millennium Development Goals
<b>MoU</b>	Memorandum of Understanding
<b>NAPs</b>	Network access points
<b>NGN</b>	Next generation network
<b>NRO</b>	Number Resource Organization, grouping all RIRs – see below
<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>Registrar</b>	A body approved ('accredited') by a registry to sell/register domain names on its behalf
<b>Registry</b>	A registry is a company or organization that maintains a centralized registry database for the TLDs or for IP address blocks (e.g. the RIRs — see below). Some registries operate without registrars at all and some operate with registrars but also allow direct registrations via the registry.
<b>RIRs</b>	Regional Internet registries. These not-for-profit organizations are responsible for distributing IP addresses on a regional level to Internet service providers and local registries.
<b>Root servers</b>	Servers that contain pointers to the authoritative name servers for all TLDs. In addition to the "original" 13 root servers carrying the IANA managed root zone file, there are now large



number of Anycast servers that provide identical information and which have been deployed worldwide by some of the original 12 operators.

<b>Root zone file</b>	Master file containing pointers to name servers for all TLDs
<b>SMEs</b>	Small and medium-sized enterprises
<b>TLD</b>	Top-level domain (see also ccTLD and gTLD)
<b>UNESCO</b>	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
<b>WGIG</b>	Working Group on Internet Governance
<b>WHOIS</b>	WHOIS is a transaction oriented query/response protocol that is widely used to provide information services to Internet users. While originally used by most (but not all) TLD Registry operators to provide “white pages” services and information about registered domain names, current deployments cover a much broader range of information services, including RIR WHOIS look-ups for IP address allocation information.
<b>WSIS</b>	World Summit on the Information Society
<b>WITSA</b>	World Information Technology and Services Alliance
<b>WTO</b>	World Trade Organization