

Fifth Meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

Vilnius, Lithuania, 14-17 September 2010

Chairman's Summary¹

The fifth meeting of the Internet Governance Forum was held in Vilnius, on 14-17 September 2010. It focused on the overall theme of 'IGF 2010 – Developing the Future Together'.

With close to 2000 badges issued and 1461 participants, attendance at the Vilnius meeting was similar to the 2009 meeting in Sharm El Sheikh.

Parallel to the main sessions, 113 workshops, best practice forums, dynamic coalition meetings and open forums were scheduled around the broad themes of the main sessions and the overall mandate of the IGF.

The IGF programme and meetings were prepared through a series of open multi-stakeholder consultations, held throughout 2010, in accordance with the IGF's interactive and participatory process.

The entire meeting was Webcast, with video streaming provided from the main session room and all nine other meeting rooms. All proceedings were transcribed and displayed in the meeting rooms in real-time and streamed to the Web. This set-up allowed for remote participants to interact with the meeting. All main sessions had simultaneous interpretation in all official UN languages. The text transcripts as well as the video and audio records of all official meetings are archived on the IGF Web site.

Remote participation was strengthened in cooperation with the remote participation working group. Remote hubs in 32 locations around the world provided the means for more than 600 people who could not travel to the meeting to participate actively in the forum and contribute to discussions.

Opening Ceremony

In his opening address to the meeting, Mr. Jomo Kwame Sundaram, Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development at UNDESA, expressed gratitude to the Government and people of the Lithuania for their warm welcome and generous hospitality on behalf of Mr. Sha Zukang, United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs. Mr. Sundaram remarked that the theme of this year's gathering "developing the future together" was particularly appropriate given the achievement of the IGF to date, the commitment of the Geneva and Tunis outcomes and the goals of the World Summit on the Information Society. He noted that while Internet use was increasing, it was growing faster in the developed world than in developing regions and that the digital divide was growing instead of shrinking.

¹ An expanded version of the Chairman's Summary, providing more details as well as the names of all session chairs, moderators speakers, panelists and attendance statistics, is available on the IGF Web site at: <http://www.intgovforum.org/>.

Her Excellency, Ms. Dalia Grybauskaitė, President of the Republic of Lithuania, told the meeting that Lithuania enjoyed one of the highest Internet speeds and mobile phone penetration rates in the world. She noted that the Internet had become an integral part of our everyday life. It was impossible to imagine modern business, public services, and the spread of information, cultural exchanges, person-to-person contacts, entertainment and leisure without the global electronic network. Furthermore, the development of the Internet was crucial to worldwide progress and the interests of all stakeholders. However, she also introduced a note of caution. While the Internet is essential to the development of knowledge society, it also posed new challenges relating to privacy, data security and the threats related to child abuse, e-theft, and intellectual property rights. These were issues that the IGF could address so that we could all take action to help to overcome these newly emerging challenges. A closer and more open dialogue between the interested stakeholders was required. The international community had no other choice but to work together so that we could create a more reliable and more secure Internet for tomorrow.

H.E. Mr. Eligijus Masiulis, Minister of Transport and Communications, Republic of Lithuania, assumed the chairmanship of the conference on behalf of the host country and thanked Forum participants for the honour of chairing the meeting. He noted that the Internet plays an integral and very important role in the economic development of all countries. In his own role as Minister responsible for information and communication technologies and also for transportation, he commented that the Internet played an important role in efficiently developing the roads, the railways and other means of transport. It also made trade better, facilitated the export of services, stimulated the business environment, and promoted competitiveness. The Internet had shown that it contributed to the growth of the GDP of all countries and that the Internet and information technologies were of utmost importance to contemporary society. The policy issues associated with these issues were a priority for Lithuania and the focus of the IGF. Lithuania recognized the importance of the IGF and would continue to be active in it.

Speakers representing all stakeholder groups addressed the session. Several themes appeared throughout the various talks. Almost all speakers made it clear that they supported the continuation of the IGF. It was noted that the IGF process was gaining momentum and a number of speakers commented on the valuable outcomes from the Forum and the ever-increasing number of national and regional IGF derived meetings. The government of Kenya offered to host the sixth UN-IGF meeting in 2011 and sought the support of participants for its expression of interest.

A number of speakers pointed out that it was important for the IGF to remain multi-stakeholder in nature. The forum's nature as a place for open exchanges without the pressure of having to negotiate outcomes should be maintained. While improvements were called for, it was important that this happened without losing the special characteristics of the IGF as a multi-stakeholder process that gave the IGF its legitimacy.

Several speakers mentioned the importance of 'the Internet way', a decentralized open and inclusive multi-stakeholder collaboration that allowed for innovation and creativity at the edges. They stressed the importance of Internet governance continuing in a decentralized way. As the Internet has unleashed the creativity of people around the world, likewise the IGF has inspired the growth in creativity the multi-stakeholder model brings to policy making. The Forum has provided a way to

exchange opinions, ideas, and concerns and has allowed for the improvement of Internet governance.

Other speakers reminded the Forum of the importance of the user, from the poorest to the richest, in the governance discussions and spoke of the importance of universal access while guaranteeing security and promoting diversity. The importance of creating and maintaining a civil rights framework for the Internet, including the rights of privacy and the right to be forgotten, was mentioned as well. Another common theme was the protection of rights generally, particularly those of children, women, persons with disabilities and vulnerable members of society.

The importance of maintaining focus on the expansion of the Internet to the billions of users who did not yet have access was emphasized by several speakers. As part of this general theme, it was pointed out that a factor to consider over the coming days was that as the number of Internet users grows worldwide, emerging economies will soon have more Internet users than the European Union and the United States combined. Several speakers noted that the Forum must recognize that the Internet is a globally important infrastructure and must agree that its governance also be global in nature.

Thematic Main Sessions

Managing Critical Internet Resources

The session was designed around a number of feeder workshops that provided input for discussion around the four main sub-themes:

- Status of IPv6 availability around the world; examples and cases;
- The internationalization of critical Internet resources management and enhanced cooperation;
- The importance of new TLDs and IDNs for development;
- Maintaining Internet services in situations of disaster and crisis.

On the situation of IPv6 deployment, the point was made that governments, as early adopters and providers of important services, have a clear role to play in procurement and can act as a model of good practice for others.

The deployment of IPv6 was likened to the migration from leaded to unleaded petrol: for a period of time unleaded petrol was only available in a few places, but quickly the situation reversed and leaded petrol became difficult to find. The same pattern was seen to be emerging for IPv6 on the Internet. A number of speakers commented on the role of governments as a major buyer in the communications markets and consequently they had power to influence technology direction through their procurement policies. Tendering processes could include the requirement that equipment be IPv6 ready. It was noted that ISPs in developing countries had less legacy equipment and, therefore new ISPs in developing countries often had more modern, IPv6 ready equipment. Another speaker commented that some of the first all IPv6 networks would probably be available in a developing country environment.

The second section of the meeting dealt with "The internationalization of critical Internet resources management and enhanced cooperation". The Chairman of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) introduced issues

his organization had worked on in the last year. In particular, he highlighted improved cooperation and coordination with governments and the Government Advisory Committee (GAC). A number of speakers noted two important deadlines, the end of the root server contracts between the government of the United States and ICANN and VeriSign respectively. These were opportunities for further progress in enhanced cooperation. Any evolution should ensure the same level of protection and security that the current system provides and the management system needed to be perfected to ensure global resources were shared equitably.

The Chair of a review team created from the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) told the meeting that the work on accountability and transparency focused on how ICANN manages its public input processes, its policy development processes and decision-making.

The third sub-theme of the session was "The importance of new TLDs and IDNs for development". ICANN had created a working group to look at the issue of the impact of new gTLDs on developing countries. The working group focused on what different kinds of support might be offered to new gTLD applicants from needy and underserved groups.

A speaker from the Haitian registry reported on the remarkable achievement of his ccTLD in ensuring continuity of service despite the destruction of the local infrastructure following the earthquake in January 2010. One of the lessons learned was that it was necessary to adopt best common practices regarding DNS operation. It is also important to have a geographic network diversity to avoid point of failure. In Haiti, efforts were now being made to develop local capacity. This was important, as in some developing countries there were often only one or two people operating the ccTLD.

The representative of the ITU described the work the organization had done following the recent floods in Pakistan and other natural disasters. The ITU had appealed to the international community to help the Pakistani administration to restore their communication infrastructure, which was badly hit by this disaster.

In his own closing remarks, the Session Chair noted that the Internet only exists because consumers –either businesses or individuals– wanted to remain connected and consume Internet products. The management of critical Internet resources must ensure access to content needed by Internet users.

Access and Diversity

The session focused on access to infrastructure and access to content and considered a range of issues from geo-location, the global reach of social networks and the linkages between access to knowledge and security solutions, both in terms of hardware and software.

In terms of infrastructure, the need for continued broadband expansion was seen as crucial by several of the speakers. The importance of inexpensive, but powerful wireless handsets and other devices was also listed as a critical ingredient in achieving global access. The tools that would enable hardware and software developers to develop networks and devices according to universal design principles were also necessary. The biggest drivers on connectivity were poverty, education

and geographic location, with people in developing countries less likely to have access than those in developed countries.

Discussions also revolved around the reasons why access was important. For developed regions it is often spoken of in terms of an everyday tool for communication and social interactions, as well as a mechanism to conduct online services. In developing regions, it was needed as access to knowledge, for example in healthcare or providing information on building water purification systems that could save lives. Access to the Internet was described as an indispensable tool to the quality of life for those disadvantaged by poverty, migrant status, disability and gender.

For a multilingual Internet three things were needed: internationalization of domain names, the availability of local content, and localization of applications and tools. The first of these was in the process of being met with the introduction of IDN ccTLDs, so that Web sites could be named in local scripts and languages. Several speakers referred to the next critical need, which was for local content in local languages and local scripts. Without this, most populations in the world, who were not familiar with English or with the Latin character sets, would not have real access. For this to happen, there needed to be development in the mechanisms for producing and distributing relevant local content.

Beyond the language aspects of diversity, speakers described the need for universal design, so that people with various levels of ability and disability would have equal access. The right to a multilingual, accessible Internet was seen as a citizen's right and a government's obligation and not something to be left to market forces alone.

The increase in the use of filters installed to block content considered illegal or harmful was also discussed. The need to balance autonomy with protection of the public good was also raised and it was argued that filtering had a negative impact on access to knowledge, particularly by students. In his closing remarks, the Chair made the point that access without openness loses its purpose.

Security, Openness and Privacy

Openness and privacy were examined through three thematic lenses:

- Issues related to social media.
- The nature and characteristics of Internet networks, technologies, and standards.
- International cooperation and collaboration on security, privacy and openness.

Most of the new technology devices that we use to manage our daily lives would not be powerful enough to hold all the applications or data we needed. Those would need to be located in the cloud. This would mean having to trust those remote data storage facilities and services. The question was how to provide reasonable privacy and security for individuals and entities that are using this new computing continuum.

From a human rights perspective, the right to privacy was a fundamental permanent right and security was a necessity for exercising all rights. So what was needed was not to balance security against privacy but to work out how to enhance both simultaneously and not allow one to erode the other.

New social media enabled a new type of interactive communication that enhanced our communication between groups and individuals. As information is shared, we also had to be concerned about the security of the data we shared and needed to protect the privacy of personal information. Writing on the Internet was different from the ephemeral nature of spoken communication, which was lost, while what we communicated online remained. A number of speakers noted that these personal data had tremendous commercial value, and that new laws to address this situation should be considered.

The point was made by many speakers that new actors had entered the media system so that the traditional means of regulating the media were no longer applicable. Media now included search engines as well as social networks. However, a representative from a social network company said it was a mistake to think the Internet was an unregulated space, when many laws and regulations existed. Online companies had to respect and work with regulators and different authorities on a daily basis. A clear point was made that we have not solved crime in an off-line world, and while that should not stop efforts to address crime online, there was also a need to be realistic.

A UNESCO commission report on policy approaches that shaped freedom of expression on the Internet had found that with increased access to information in cyberspace, censorship and filtering was done not only by government, but also by private companies.

The session also addressed issues of international cooperation and collaboration, and considered human rights norms and conventions. The Budapest Convention was mentioned as one of the tools that addressed cybercrime standards and norms. It had the force of law and could potentially be applied worldwide and had been drafted with the participation of non-European countries.

Threats to cybersecurity came from a number of sources, such as outdated legal architecture, bad practices and natural disasters that contribute to cyber insecurity. The moderator noted that the speed at which cybercrime evolves is so fast that legislation is not well suited to address it.

In his closing remarks the Session Chair noted that it was of paramount importance that the Internet was made safe for children and youngsters. He also noted that the lack of skills of ordinary users was itself a serious threat to the security of the Internet. Capacity building was essential to the future security of the Internet, he concluded.

Internet Governance for Development

Internet Governance for Development has been a crosscutting priority of the IGF since the first meeting in Athens in 2006. For the 2010 meeting it was introduced as a new theme for a main session.

The session explored the possible effects of global Internet governance arrangements on the development of the Internet in developing countries. The discussion considered the institutional processes and substantive policy outputs of governance arrangements and whether these may raise developmental concerns that have not received sufficient attention to date.

The session looked at the meaning of Internet governance for development (IG4D). Among others, the following points were made:

Internet governance for development

- Needs to be understood from the perspective of a sustainable development that meets three needs: social equity, preserving the environment, and economic efficiency;
- Is governance that adequately and proportionally represents developing countries in its mechanisms and processes;
- Must enable innovation in developing countries;
- Advances the development of the Internet in developing and transitional countries and promotes Internet enabled development;
- Takes a global view and is governance for both the developing and developed worlds.

Other points made included the following:

- The Internet was critical for the development of developing nations;
- The demographics of the Internet were changing and the voice of the developing countries needed to be included in the way the Internet was governed and managed;
- Internet governance for development must be seen in terms of the impact it had on ordinary people and in terms of human development;
- Development had to be considered in every Internet governance decision.

The session subsequently discussed how developing and other countries organize and manage their national-level engagement with global Internet governance in the context of their wider national ICT strategies

Several speakers described the process in their countries or regions:

- Brazil discussed their multi-stakeholder national governance process with representatives from government, the private sector and civil society. It was described as a lightweight process that was not expensive. Mention was also made of the Internet principles that Brazil had standardized and which were being acknowledged in many IGF sessions and workshops;
- Senegal pointed to their national IGF and to their Head of State who was very involved in ICT and the WSIS process. The focus in Senegal had been to build out the broadband infrastructure. The country had also put a lot of effort into their research and education network. One challenge facing ICT Senegal was how to serve a population with a 70% illiteracy rate;

The session then proposed methods of how to take an IG4D agenda forward in the IGF and other international settings, such as:

- An evaluation of different Internet governance initiatives should be carried out to understand their impact on development;
- National and regional IGF type meetings should be held in developing countries.

In his closing remarks the moderator remarked on the fact that on one hand the Internet was highly complex and that on the other it was very easy to use. This

created a disinterest in Internet governance with most people, as they just could not see the need, unless it was related to the cost of local access.

The Session Chair concluded by mentioning an old saying that there was only a short distance between strict dictatorship and uncontrollable anarchy and mentioned his belief that multistakeholder governance could help us avoid those extremes.

Emerging Issues - Cloud Computing

This session brought together an overview of the issues from both the policy and the technical standpoints in the area and provided an initial exploration of the possible Internet governance considerations within cloud computing.

In his introduction, the Session Chair described some of the challenges in meeting the promise of cloud computing including both the challenges in terms of computer science and expense as well as in terms of security and privacy.

Perspectives on the cloud included the following:

Panellists described the cloud as a continuation of the network that existed in the past. Within the cloud one is not only able to programme software, but also able to programme the whole infrastructure of the Internet and offer it as a service. The benefit to consumers is significant as the cloud functions essentially as a black box. Services operate consistently regardless of the underlying systems. The cloud offers the Internet with the same advantages that the distribution of electricity had offered in the past. Just as consumers of electricity no longer had to generate their own electricity, now consumers of information technology no longer need to maintain their own information technology infrastructure. As the mobile world continues to rapidly expand the cloud plays a crucial role as current portable devices lack the storage capacities and power of full size machines and seek the cloud to provide them with their core services.

A panellist raised concern with the security measures in and around the cloud and whether user records stored require adequate, effective and enforceable protection in order to generate the confidence for users to take up these services. Cloud service providers would have to be transparent and accountable for their services, including modification requirements and independent data security audits to ensure the safety of the data.

Another area of concern for the cloud was the difference in policy between countries on what could be done with undisclosed personal data. Law enforcement would have easier means to access this data. The cloud should be protected by the same safe guards against public and private interference as is data today on our desks or on our hard drives.

Among the questions raised were the following:

- Would the cloud become dominated by a few large companies that acted like the major utilities firms as had been seen in the field of electrical distribution?
- Would the utility nature of the cloud help or hinder innovation, and what policies would be needed to mitigate any negative effect of the cloud?

- What framework would be needed, given the complexity of cloud computing, to build trust in the cloud, especially in terms of confidentiality and privacy?

The Session Chair concluded by looking at the various facets of cloud computing ranging from the infrastructure to social and policy issues. He mentioned the security problems involved and noted that efforts to secure our data and computing procedures are getting more complicated. He also linked this emerging issue cloud computing to the Internet of things, which in his view was the emerging issue for future IGF meetings.

Taking Stock of Internet governance and the way forward

The session took stock of the evolution of the overall Internet governance landscape since the first IGF meeting in Athens in 2006. It established a checkpoint on the changes seen in the practice of Internet governance over the first five years of the IGF. It also set a baseline from which to measure the changes over the next five years leading up to the ten-year review of implementation of and follow-up to the outcome of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) in 2015. Contributors focused on the current status of Internet governance in the Internet and on how it had changed since the IGF was created.

It was generally felt that:

- The themes defined in 2006 are still very relevant today
- The discussions have matured and deepened over the years.

The meeting discussed whether the context of the discussions had changed from Athens to Vilnius. Several speakers noted that as the context of the Internet had changed, so had the discussion in the IGF. It was pointed out that the Internet had grown in the last five years and that the Internet of 2010 was not that same as the Internet in 2005. The IGF was seen as having grown alongside the Internet.

While speakers acknowledged that there was still much work to be done, the discussions had matured and moved from basic explanations to good practices and deployment issues. On some issues like internationalization of critical Internet resources speakers felt that progress had been made. The discussions had moved on from the need to explain the importance on multilingualism, to the methods of deploying Internationalized Domain Names and of user content in diverse languages and scripts. Another way in which the context change of the conversations was described was that they moved from a theoretical discourse to practical discussions.

Several speakers, including several parliamentarians, mentioned the IGF's success and growth over the years. One of the significant examples was the widespread introduction of regional and national IGF type meetings that have occurred over the last two years. The National IGF initiatives, had contributed to the debates between government, parliamentarians, industry and civil society. This had changed the nature of Internet governance in those countries and had led to moves toward cooperative models of regulation. The maturation of the discussions over the years was mentioned as evidence of advancement in global governance. Specific topics such as the growth of IXPs and the awareness of the addressing issues concerning IPv4 and IPv6 were listed as examples of the progress in global governance during the five years of the IGF. The multistakeholder model, largely initiated at the IGF was

also seen as an advance in global Internet governance. This included the ability of all stakeholders to speak and listen to each other. Many speakers attached great importance to capacity building. They described the proliferation of national and regional IGFs as a testament to the growth in both individual and institutional capacity.

While several speakers talked about the need for a more results oriented IGF, others saw in the IGF practice of not negotiating outcomes one of its strengths, as it allowed for open discussions free from the pressure of negotiations. Several people used the example of the multistakeholder dialogue and sharing of information and good practices as proof for the IGF's viability. Papers such as the Inventory of Good Practices that was posted on the IGF Web site shortly before the Vilnius meeting were mentioned as examples of more tangible results.

The increased participation of young people in the 2010 IGF meeting was seen as a positive development. A member of the youth coalition held the view that including more youth participation and listening more to the youth participants would help in producing outcomes of greater depth in areas like censorship, privacy and the digital divide. The participants were also reminded that the young people were the experts and that they brought a much-needed expertise to the Forum. "Let us not waste time talking about the youth, but let the youth talk", he concluded.

The representative of Azerbaijan offered for his country to host the 2012 IGF in Baku, provided if the IGF mandate were renewed.

In his closing remarks the Session Chair-concluded by observing that power is devolving from governments to other actors through interconnected networks and that the IGF is part of this trend.

Closing Session

The closing session was chaired by Mr. Rimvydas Vaštakas, Vice Minister of Transport and Communications of Lithuania

The Speakers, representing the various stakeholder groups, commented on multistakeholder cooperation and the growth and maturation in the past five years of the IGF. Recurring statements in the speeches included the IGF's success through its flexibility and ability to keep up with emerging technology such as cloud computing, a topic that was unheard of at the IGF's inception in 2005. The multistakeholder vehicle has proven to be a great success in creating relationships between members in different areas of society. The multistakeholder IGF needs to continue to be refined allowing for a broadening of the process permitting greater participation and cooperation.

Speakers also looked ahead toward future IGFs giving suggestions to what needs to be discussed. A speaker commented that while the IGF provides a forum for dialogue, it has not yet begun to make recommendations to the organizations involved in Internet governance, as had been the expectation by some at the time of the Tunis Agenda.

In closing the 2011 IGF meeting, the Chairman acknowledged the progress gained by the participants in shared understanding and knowledge of Internet governance issues. He reminded participants that the main focus of this IGF was "Developing the

future together". The meeting had looked at ways on how to give better access to the Internet, how to make better use of the Internet and how to prevent its abuse. He recalled that the Internet offers unprecedented opportunities, but it also creates new challenges. In his view, the IGF is here to help maximize the opportunities and to minimize the challenges. The discussions held in the IGF have made it clear once again that achieving these objectives is possible only by collaborative action by all stakeholders.

He thanked all participants for contributing to the success of the meeting. They came to Vilnius not just to listen, but also to contribute actively, to organize workshops and other meetings and to engage in dialogue. This was maybe the most important feature of the IGF: all stakeholders engage in dialogue as equals. He described dialogue as a two way street that means more than reading a prepared speech; it also means listening to what others have to say. He went on to say that this sustained interest in the meetings of the IGF, in all regions of the world, clearly shows that there is a need for this kind of multistakeholder dialogue. Before closing the meeting, he said that the Government of Lithuania would make its voice heard in the forthcoming debate of the United Nations General Assembly, adding that it was important to renew the IGF mandate as a multistakeholder platform for non-binding multistakeholder dialogue.

ANNEX

Introductory Sessions

Internet governance - Setting the Scene

The objective of the session was to provide participants with the historical context of the IGF and an introduction to the main issues of the Vilnius meeting. The session began with brief presentations by the editor and five of the experts who authored background papers on the principal themes of the IGF meeting in the proceedings of the 2009 meeting in Sharm el Sheikh, Egypt. The purpose of the background section (section II) of the book, Internet Governance: creating opportunities for all², which had been distributed to all participants and which was made available on the IGF Web site to provide the historical context of the IGF. Each article was intended to serve three purposes:

- Review how the dialogue on each of those themes had evolved from Athens through Sharm el Sheikh, reviewing the main points and the recurrent themes;
- Assess the progress that might have occurred and review whether there had been growth in the convergence of perspectives;
- Offer the authors' recommendations on how the IGF might take the issues forward.

The author of the paper on critical Internet resources explained the sensitivity of this theme from its origins during the WSIS process. She remarked that the issue had become more tractable within the IGF and offered a few reasons, including the inclusion of civil society and the Internet technical community in a discussion that before had been limited to the intergovernmental actors in WSIS. She also saw the non-decision making nature of the IGF as key to defusing the polemics surrounding the discussions of this issue.

The author of the paper on openness spoke first of the progression of the discussions related to this theme in the IGF meetings. They had moved from freedom of expression in the Internet and its relation to human rights, intellectual property and the rights of authors and consumers to the links to privacy and security and the implication in social networking. Over the five years the theme had shown the need for balance among the requirements for access to knowledge, freedom of expression the need to maintain security and the essential privacy of individuals.

Linguistic diversity was the focus of the chapter on diversity. The author made the point that the participants of the IGF understood the need for diversity implicitly as they were a very diverse group of stakeholders. She spoke of the importance of the common belief that the Internet was for everyone, from the most knowledgeable technicians to the indigenous people with disabilities in remote regions.

The co-author of the paper on access started by outlining the sub themes that had been central to the IGF meeting over the previous years. In Athens, the IGF discussed Internet Exchange Points (IXP), in Rio the topic moved on to policy, regulation and the respective roles of stakeholders, in Hyderabad the discussion

² Internet Governance: Creating Opportunities for All---The Fourth Internet Governance Forum, Sharm el Sheikh, Egypt, 15-18 November 2009. Edited by William J. Drake.

centred on the failure of markets, or perhaps the absence of capable markets, to improve the access in many countries and in Sharm there was a converging on the need for an enabling policy and regulation environment to be established.

The author of the paper on security spoke of security as an evolving need in the Internet. Security at the IGF had dealt with the fears expressed by many and had attempted to create some understanding of the processes and solutions available. Some of the focus has been on the discussion of cyber-crime and the degree to which this was a new category of crime or was essentially the same crime as had always just existed just perpetrated via the Internet. A final point that was brought up was the lag between awareness of an issue within the technical and operational communities and the discussion in policy venues. In this regard, the IGF provided a good platform for capacity building on security issues.

The two commentators gave their impressions at the end of the session. One of them described the book as capturing the process of the IGF in a "manner that could be called continuity in change". He noted that the IGF had delved more deeply into development as the years went on and that because there were no specific outcome negotiations, the national participants had taken what had been discussed in the IGF and used it, and augmented it, in a regional and national context. The other commentator described the book as a reference not only for today but for years to come and not only as a description of the Sharm El Sheikh IGF but an explanation of how these issues have evolved over the last years.

Regional Perspectives

The moderator introduced the session by reminding participants that the spread of the IGF multi-stakeholder model through the proliferation of regional and national IGF processes was one of the notable successes of the forum. This year's IGF devoted more space to these IGF initiatives. The main aim of this curtain raiser session was to compare the various regional initiatives, to explore their differences, to find commonalities and improve the linkages with the global IGF.

Panellists described the key priorities that had emerged from their respective meetings. The third East Africa IGF brought together stakeholders from Rwanda, Tanzania, Burundi, South Sudan, Uganda, and Kenya to identify, explore, and build consensus around common Internet Governance priority issues. The EA-IGF model followed a bottom up multi-stakeholder approach that does not mimic the agenda of the global meeting, but is informed by it, and serves to bring the views of the region to the global forum. Participants at the EA-IGF emphasized the need to harmonize regulatory frameworks to facilitate cross border network operations.

The goal of the West African IGF was for the regional processes to feed into the global IGF through both messages and the experience of participants who had worked in the national and regional discussions and could bring the knowledge to the global level. The theme of the West African IGF was promoting the multi-stakeholder model for further Internet development in Africa, which is very much in the spirit of the theme for the global Internet Governance Forum. Participants recognized and acknowledged that in many West African countries, democracy has yet to take firm hold and that was why it was particularly important to have a process like the IGF to further strengthen the democratic spirit and the concentration on policy formulation and development.

The IGF process in Latin America had evolved in an interesting way. It had followed the global IGF agenda, the intention being to identify the characteristics and the challenges on the regional level of each of the global themes. However, discussion of security and privacy in the regional initiative had evolved beyond that of the global level. They had separated the topic of openness from privacy and security which made it possible to make it more relevant for the region, focusing, for example on the topics of freedom of expression, access to knowledge, free flow of information, open governance, infrastructure, and open technology.

A participant from the audience drew attention to the Caribbean IGF, now in its sixth year and the oldest of all the regional IGF meetings, pre-dating the global IGF itself. Organized by the Caribbean Telecommunications Union and CARICOM Secretariat, the meeting addressed many of the same issues as the Latin American meeting.

The Asia Pacific Regional IGF (APrIGF) was the first regional IGF type meeting in the Asia Pacific region. It followed the global IGF agenda, and decided to follow a simple outcome approach where the meeting would deliver "learnings" rather than outcomes. There was a consensus on a common interest in Internet governance for development. Participants recognized that participation from governments was important and, at the same time, also suggested that non-IT civil society engagement on Internet governance needed to be better developed and encouraged.

A great deal of effort had been undertaken in the Arabic region since the IGF meeting in Egypt, most notably around the issues of implementing IDN ccTLDs. This work had been a success, and the IGF had played a role in achieving this important progress. A technical team responsible for Internet issues had begun work, cooperation with the ITU had progressed, and a regional association of Internet service providers had improved coordination across the region. In what was seen as an important development, organizations had begun encouraging and taking public comments and multi-stakeholder input on policy process. Holding an Arab region IGF type meeting in the near future would help develop a clearer vision about all needs within the region.

One of the features of the Pan-European dialogue on Internet governance (EuroDIG) was the presentation of outcomes from the process, called "messages from Madrid". The messages are not negotiated texts; they were compiled by rapporteurs, in consultation with the organizing teams of each session and serve as key outcomes from Europe into the global debate. EuroDIG has an all-inclusive policy, inviting not just European participants but all interested parties. The meeting served to bridge the issues across all the national IGFs of Europe, as well as welcoming inputs from outside the region. The overall goal was to raise some key messages from Europe to the global debate.

The Commonwealth IGF initiative saw an overwhelming need for capacity building, a safer online environment, the greater attention to the multi-stakeholder approach, and concerns about the future of the global IGF. When the Commonwealth organized programmes addressing ICT issues, the Commonwealth IGF attempted to introduce a module into the agenda related to Internet Governance and Internet policy. The goal was to draw interested people into the relevant governance processes.

All panellists agreed that there would be merit in strengthening the linkages between the regional IGF initiatives and the global IGF and also in exchanging information and experiences between the various regional initiatives.