

Third Meeting of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF)

Hyderabad, India, 3 – 6 December 2008

Chairman's Summary

The third meeting of the Internet Governance Forum was held in Hyderabad, India, on 3-6 December 2008 and focused on the overall theme of 'Internet for All'. The meeting was held in the aftermath of terrorist attacks in Mumbai. The participants expressed their sympathies to the families of the victims and the Government and the people of India. While these tragic events led to some cancellations, the overall attendance with 1280 participants from 94 countries, of which 133 were media representatives, was close to that at the second annual meeting.

All the five main sessions were organized as three thematic days under the following headings: 'Reaching the Next Billion', 'Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust', 'Managing Critical Internet Resources'. The last day covered 'Emerging Issues - the Internet of Tomorrow' and 'Taking Stock and the Way Forward'. Each of the sessions was chaired by the host country and moderated by journalists or independent experts.

Parallel to the main sessions, 87 workshops, best practise forums, dynamic coalition meetings and open forums were scheduled around the broad themes of the main sessions and the overall mandate of the IGF. Five workshops and other meetings were cancelled following the events in Mumbai.

The IGF programme and meeting were prepared through a series of open, multistakeholder consultations held throughout 2008, a process that also designed the IGF's interactive and participatory structure.

The entire meeting was Webcast, with video and audio streaming provided from all meeting rooms. The proceedings of the main sessions were transcribed and displayed in the main session hall in realtime and streamed to the Web. The text transcripts of the main sessions, the video and audio records of all workshops and other meetings will be made available through the IGF Web site. This set up allowed for remote participants to interact with the meeting. All main sessions had simultaneous interpretation in all UN languages and in Hindi.

Opening Ceremony and Opening Session

In his message to the IGF Meeting, Mr. Jomo Kwame Sundaram, Assistant Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), on behalf of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, expressed his condolences to the families of the victims of the terrorist attacks in Mumbai and the meeting rose for a moment's silence to commemorate the victims. Mr. Jomo expressed his gratitude to IGF participants for showing their solidarity with the people and Government of India by attending the meeting and he expressed his deep thanks to the Government of India for their gracious and generous hospitality. He described the Internet as the backbone of our globalized world which was transforming our lives. Thus, all users should take an interest in how it was run and managed. Mr. Jomo described the IGF as a valuable melting pot for forging a common understanding of complex Internet issues from diverse points of views and he noted that the IGF was a space for frank

and enlightened debate, shaping and informing the decision-making processes. He announced that the 2010 IGF Meeting would take place in Vilnius, Lithuania.

H. E. Mr. Thiru Andimuthu Raja, Union Cabinet Minister for Communications and Information Technology of the Government of India, underlined that the Internet had tremendous potential for promoting global partnership for development, as set out in the Millennium Development Goals, and stressed the role of the IGF in building an Internet society which was inclusive, human centred and geared to development. India believed that IT infrastructure was the key to rapid economic and social development of the country. In order to promote education and other services and access to the Internet, the Government of India had embarked on a national programme to make the Internet available to the citizens through common service centres. He noted that access to information by the people helped democracy by having transparency in the functioning of the government and enhanced the participation of the people in the governing process. Without appropriate information, people could not adequately exercise their rights as citizens.

Other speakers at the opening ceremony were Mr. Nitin Desai, Special Adviser to the Secretary-General for Internet Governance and Chairman of the Multi stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) and H. E. Mr. Damodar Reddy, Minister for IT of the Government of Andhra Pradesh.

At the closure of the opening ceremony, in accordance with the IGF tradition, H. E. Mr. Thiru Andimuthu Raja, Union Cabinet Minister for Communications and Information Technology, assumed the Chairmanship of the meeting by acclamation.

During the opening session, nine speakers representing all stakeholder groups addressed the meeting. (A list of all speakers of all main sessions is attached at Annex.) A common thread through all the speeches was the recognition of the importance of the meeting's overall motto, 'Internet for All'. It was noted that the Internet was bringing great potential for economic and social benefit to the world. At the same time, speakers also pointed out that there was a need to guard against the problems the Internet could bring when used for harmful purposes. Speakers noted the opportunity the IGF provided for a dialogue between all stakeholders and a mutual exchange of ideas. It allowed to build partnerships and relationships that otherwise might not occur. The IGF was appreciated for its open multistakeholder model, with examples of new national and regional IGF initiatives illustrating the spread of the multistakeholder ideal and its value in policy discussion.

Main Sessions

The first three days of the Forum were designed around three main themes for each day: 'Reaching the Next Billion', 'Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust', 'Managing Critical Internet Resources'. Each morning, two panel discussions examined key issues of the day's theme, followed by an afternoon with an open dialogue session which provided the opportunity for Forum participants, both in the room and through remote access, to join the dialogue and go deeper into the issues raised in the morning.

Reaching the Next Billion

- Realizing a Multilingual Internet

- Access: Reaching the Next Billions

The two panel discussions were devoted to the central theme of the 'Internet for All: Reaching the Next Billion'.

Realizing a Multilingual Internet

The first panel, dedicated to the issue of 'Realizing a Multilingual Internet', was chaired by Mr. Ajit Balakrishnan, Chief Executive Officer at Rediff.Com, and moderated by Ms. Miriam Nisbet, Director of the UNESCO Information Society Division.

The panel discussed issues related to multilingualism and promoting diversity on the Internet, including accessibility and the importance of enabling access for people with disabilities.

The Chair of the session underlined the challenge of making the Internet available to people of all languages and drew attention to the situation in India, a case in point. As the world was looking to increase Internet users by a billion, India would have to contribute at least 250 million of that, from an estimated present user base of roughly 40 million.

The session identified five issues for the afternoon dialogue to consider:

- The importance of having content in local languages, and that people should be able to create and receive information in their local language to express themselves in ways that their peers could understand.
- The importance of localization and availability of tools, including both software and hardware, for example, as well as keyboards and other devices, search engines, browsers, translation tools which should be available in multiple languages.
- Efforts to internationalize domain names were emphasized by many, with a number of speakers pointing to the technological difficulties as well as the complex policy and political aspects, such as the work undertaken by Arabic script IDN Working Group and how that model could be taken to other language groups to move that issue forward.
- The session noted that online communication was increasingly occurring in media other than in written forms, and that multilingualism in mobile and multiple media was something that needed to be considered.
- Lastly, there was no common framework and a common 'language' for addressing these issues and it was in this context in particular that the IGF might move the discussion forward.

Access: Reaching the Next Billions

The second panel was chaired by Mr. Kiran Karnik, Member of the Scientific Advisory Council to the Prime Minister of India and Founder-Director of the Indian Space Research Organisation's Development and Educational Communicational Unit, and moderated by Ms. Anriette Esterhuysen, Executive Director of the Association for Progressive Communications (APC).

The Chair noted the critical importance of not just considering how access could be increased to the next billion, but the next billions, all of those still outside. The Internet was not just about business; it was about empowerment, and that depended on access. Second, access required a number of factors, such as connectivity and affordability, but affordability did not mean low cost alone. It was also about using existing devices like mobile phones or, more importantly, new ways of providing access either through community means or through new business models where access was effectively paid for by somebody else.

The session examined the issues of access from the three main areas of supply, demand and development and was successful in reaching consensus in many areas, with a key message that access needed to be viewed in the context of an ecosystem and that the access gap could not be addressed without looking at various facets. One such facet of the ecosystem was policy and regulation, which needed to be conducive to a market structure that could encourage investment, with investment following from more than one source, from government, from the private sector and other mechanisms. Affordability was part of the ecosystem and affordable infrastructure was a fundamental building block.

Speakers considered leadership to be a key factor, linking aspects of policy and regulation to investment and to capacity development. Noting that to achieve sustainability a process of institutionalization was required: one-off policy reforms did not provide lasting solutions, and regulatory institutions had to be able to adapt to change that provided continuity. It was also pointed out that reaching the next billions would require an enormous investment of capital, which in turn would require a public policy environment that created incentives for investment. Further, it was suggested that such an environment should include regulatory transparency and predictability, provided by an independent regulatory regime.

Another key message was to agree on the roles of the different stakeholders; the role of the state, of the private sector, civil society and technical experts. How could they collaborate and ensure complementarity, as opposed to working at cross-purposes. The IGF and the sessions in Hyderabad were part of a solution to clarifying this aspect in particular.

Considering supply and demand, there was some agreement that supply-driven models alone were not enough, demand actually existed and needed to be identified and captured and this called for increased awareness among users, human capacity building, and use of ICT for broader social purposes such as education and healthcare. It was also mentioned that to achieve increased access, there was also need for sufficient supply, effective demand, and a functioning market. One speaker held the view that there was proof that competition could drive down prices, increase choices, and expand choices.

The importance of mobile communications as the means of reaching many of the new users coming to the Internet was strongly recognized. It was noted that the Internet provided the opportunity for users not only to be consumers, but also producers and citizens, and that therefore it would be essential to ensuring that improved access would enable empowerment.

Open Dialogue Session

The Open Dialogue session in the afternoon was chaired by Dr. B. K. Gairola, Director General NIC, Government of India. The session was moderated by Mr. Hidetoshi Fujisawa, Chief Commentator and Program Host, NHK Japan

Broadcasting Corporation, with co-moderators Ms. Alison Gillwald, Director of Research, ICT Africa, and Mr. Patrick Fältström, Consulting Engineer, Cisco Systems; Member, Board of Internet Society; Member, Swedish Government IT Advisory Group.

The session sought to identify the linkages between the two morning themes in achieving 'Internet for All', and provided an opportunity for all Forum participants to deepen and enrich the discussion.

A key message from the dialogue was that when considering the theme of connecting the next billion, that there was tremendous pent-up demand when thinking about those coming online next while at the same time significant barriers for connecting the last billion. These two issues needed to be considered at the same time.

Existing barriers in many countries in terms of market entry were the main reason for our inability to provide affordable access and these were policy issues that could and should be addressed. However, while liberalizing markets was the obvious solution, the modalities of the liberalization process were important. It was noted that liberalizing markets was more than a matter of opening up markets, as with infrastructure industries it was difficult to achieve the kind of perfect competition that would allow for the efficient allocation of resources. Therefore, regulatory frameworks that provided certainty and stability, and also incentives for investment were required. Such a public policy framework needed to address market structure, competition and regulation, and also needed to address issues of market failure, and questions of universal service and of ensuring equity between those who had access and those that did not.

There was discussion about some promising experiences of increasing access, including the prospect for mobile services to be the primary platform for Internet in the developing world. Contributions to the dialogue noted the importance of competition throughout the connectivity chain, from international transport and gateways through intra-country transport, the use of Internet Exchange Points to maximize the local exchange of traffic, and the value of business usage of the Internet and of VoIP in driving demand and contributing to economic growth.

In response to a question, one speaker referred to why Denmark had been so successful in broadband deployment, noting that the country had adopted a flexible regulatory environment, had chosen a market-driven approach, reliance on private investments, an emphasis on regulatory stability and transparency, and avoidance of regulatory micromanagement. The regulatory regime should be flexible and able to adapt. Denmark began with service-based competition to start the process. The focus now was on facility-based, infrastructure-based competition. Availability of content was also important. In this regard, the speaker pointed out that user generated content was important in Denmark, as was peer-to-peer and development of e-skills.

Commentators noted that multilingualism was not only concerned with written language. Multilingualism had also to consider access and creation of content. The next billion users should not only be receivers of information, but also the creators of content and sources of innovation. In discussions about local content, the session noted that it was not about geography, but about culture, language or script used to represent the content people wished to use or create. It was generally felt that reaching the next billion would also make the Internet more global.

Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust

- Dimensions of cyber-security and cyber-crime
- Fostering Security, Privacy and Openness

The second day focused on the theme of 'Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust'. The topic was covered in two panel discussions, one on the 'Dimensions of Cyber-security and Cyber-crime', and the second on 'Fostering Security, Privacy and Openness'. These were followed by an Open Dialogue.

Dimensions of cyber-security and cyber-crime

The first session was chaired by Mr. Rentala Chandershekhar, Special Secretary of the Department of Information Technology in the Indian Ministry of Communications & Information Technology, and moderated by Mr. Bertrand de la Chapelle, Special Envoy for Information Society of the French Foreign Ministry.

The discussion began with a reminder of how much the Internet had grown and how critical it had become for governments, for commerce, for the economy in general, for civil society and for researchers. The discussion then went on to discuss the problems that this reliance has brought. It was pointed out that the Internet was not built to be secure, but open, and that openness, while intrinsically good, also made it vulnerable. Bad things could happen, data could be lost, and data could be compromised. While sometimes this was accidental, sometimes it was the product of criminal behavior. It was considered a chilling fact that those engaged in maliciously causing security problems were one step ahead. Quite often they were more technically advanced than those who are engaged in solving the problems, especially in the case of developing economies.

It was noted that most off-line crimes had now also moved on-line. There were also new forms of crime that were specific to the Internet, such as hacking or phishing. In addition, there were also attacks on a country's critical infrastructure, such as distributed denial of service attacks (DDOS). Examples of attacks on sewage systems or air traffic control were also mentioned in this context. There was general acceptance that crime and criminality in any society was dealt with through law enforcement. But it was also noted that law enforcement was made difficult by the borderless nature of the Internet. While in the off-line world the perpetrator of a crime could be traced to the locality where the crime was committed, this was not the case anymore in the on-line world. Law enforcement therefore was confronted with problems of jurisdiction and geographical boundaries. In addition, legislation in general was slow to adapt to a fast-changing technological environment. The discussion included the realization that the emergence of Internet threats and the use of the Internet for illegitimate purposes required new solutions in dealing with cyber-crime.

It was also noted that there were a vast number of stakeholders involved at various levels, and that the cooperation of all of these stakeholders was needed to resolve the issues that were discussed in the session. Several of the presenters pointed out that all users were part of the Internet and that therefore, unwittingly, could be a part of the problem as well. It was therefore important for all users to be a part of the solution instead.

There was a general understanding that there was a need for multistakeholder collaboration, cooperation and coordination at all levels: national, regional and

international. The representative of the ITU presented the organization's Global Cyber Security Agenda. A High Level Expert Group had been set up, comprising some 100 experts, representing all stakeholder groups. The ITU based its work on five pillars:

- Legal measures
- Technical and procedural measures
- Organizational structures
- Capacity-building
- International cooperation.

While the problem was global, there was a need for action at the local level. For this reason the ITU had approached a combined bottom-up/top-down approach.

The issues discussed in the panel were summarized as follows:

- The need for prevention, and not only remediation, but prevention defined as proactive measures to make attacks harder.
- The need for a more resilient architecture.
- The need for establishing a feedback loop between prevention, analysis of incidents, and remediation.
- The need for coordination of many actors involved in the prevention, remediation and related issues. They were from all categories of stakeholders. It was essential to build trust networks among those actors. To build such a network would require time.
- The need for cross-sectoral multistakeholder cooperation. This required avoiding the urge to address the issues in silos of actors and instead bringing all actors together, that is governments, the private sector, civil society and the technical sector. Discussions should be organized on an issue basis by all actors concerned.

There was a general agreement that there was a need to intensify efforts to tackle efforts to combat cyber-crime. A final point was made concerning the role of the IGF in this area and how it could help the various organizations that were dealing with those issues in various regions, and various categories of actors to interact with one another and find solutions.

Fostering Security, Privacy and Openness

The second session, 'Fostering security, privacy and openness', was chaired by Mr. Shyamai Ghosh, Chairman of the Data Security Council of India (DSCI) and moderated by Ambassador David A. Gross, Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy in the United States Department of State.

The session started off with a mention of the conflict in the sense of national security versus security for privacy, and the right to information and a mention of how increasing the level of user security and privacy, confidence and trust could be engendered for use of Internet and facilitated free expression of opinion.

The Chair spoke of how the Internet was global, but privacy could be local, regional or national in context. As the Internet had become a way of life, there were societal issues which needed to be addressed. In the Indian context, it was explained that nine million subscribers were being added every month. Governance was considered to become a relevant point in these circumstances.

The moderator began the meeting by talking about the resurgence in importance of the issues of this session. While these issues were front burner in the 1990s, over the last few years they had been less important. Now they had come to the fore, because they were in the confluence of societally important issues that were, in many respects, in conflict with each other and yet are additive of each other: security, privacy, and openness.

The session was rooted by the mention of several important declarations and documents:

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) with regard to the free flow of information and its importance.
- The Tunis Agenda was a high watermark for the commitment to free flow of information, both in paragraphs 4 and in 42.
- The OECD ministerial contained many important statements there on the free flow of information.
- The International Telecommunications Union at the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly, offered in Resolution 69 an strong statement about the free flow of information in which Member States were invited to refrain from taking any unilateral or discriminatory actions that could impede another Member from accessing public Internet sites.
- The Global Network Initiative which brought together a number of NGOs and companies with the aim to address the issues of protecting freedom of expression and privacy for users.

In the discussion, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of the Child and the European Convention on Cyber-crime were added to the list of important agreements related to the topic of security privacy and openness.

One panellist explained how the whole debate about privacy, openness, and security could be shown in the dimension of women's human rights. The discussion focused on the specific issue of sexual rights defined in the Cairo Program of Action, as a state of physical, emotional, mental, and social well-being related to sexuality. This definition was not merely related to the absence of disease, dysfunction, or infirmity, but it also required a positive approach to sexuality and sexual relationships as well as the possibility of having safe sexual experiences, free from coercion, discrimination, and violence. The numerous human rights were discussed as having a direct bearing on sexual rights and sexual health. These included the right to liberty and security of the person, the right to be free from torture and inhuman and degrading treatment, the right to private and family life, the right to nondiscrimination, and, specific to this session, the right to information and education. The presentation went on to explain that the Internet had provided a kind of critical space to enable women to explore their sexual agency, to be able to acquire information about sexual and reproductive health that may or may not be available in other sorts of public spaces. The Internet also allowed women to explore a more positive and more active form of sexual expression that puts women as the sexual actor, not as the object that is being acted upon. The Internet had also become a critical space for women of marginalized and diverse sexualities to network, to exchange information, and to be able to build communities with each other. And this was where it also intersected with issues of privacy.

The moderator brought up the confluence of freedom of sexual expression, as content on the Internet, with the discussion of protection of children.

It was pointed out that the OECD Ministerial Meeting, held in Seoul in June 2008, concluded that there was a correlation between information flows, ICTs, innovation

and economic growth, while recognizing that there were risks associated with the use of these technologies and the need to address them in an appropriate fashion.

In terms of protection of children on the Internet, five categories of risk were mentioned:

- content
- contact
- addiction
- commerce
- privacy.

The increased awareness of the importance of data protection was mentioned as regards not only the protection of private sphere of individuals, but their very freedom. Internal and international security requirements and market interests could lead to the erosion of fundamental safeguards of privacy and freedom. It was discussed how data that were collected for one specific purpose were often made available for other purposes and made available to bodies, both public and private, that were not intended recipients of these data.

The representative of UNESCO recalled that the UNESCO constitution, created over 60 years ago, talked about free flow of ideas, information, and knowledge, while Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was the anchor for freedom of expression and freedom of the press. In recent years this fundamental principle had been applied not only to the traditional media of printed press, radio and television, but also to new and emerging technologies. UNESCO had referred to this as the freedom of expression applying to technologies without frontiers.

The discussion moved on to the lack of trust the user often had in using technologies, particularly in e-commerce and other financial applications. The user was described as worried about the cyber threats, like virus forms or trojans or identity theft, while organizations were described as worried about the theft of data.

The moderator mentioned an issue that was alluded to, but not discussed in this session, that is, the role of anonymity on the Internet and its relation to privacy, especially in spheres such as medical information.

In concluding, the Chair spoke of the challenge in converting the areas of tension or conflict into areas of convergence, so that both the issues of security and privacy could be addressed in the proper perspective.

Open Dialogue Session

The open dialogue was chaired by Mr. Pavan Duggal, President of Cyberlaws.Net and Dr. Gulshan Rai, Director CERT-In. The moderator of the session was Mr. Jonathan Charles, BBC Foreign Correspondent and News Presenter, and co-moderated by Natasha Primo, the National ICT Policy Advocacy Coordinator for the Association for Progressive Communications, and Mr. Everton Lucero, Counselor for Science and Technology at the Embassy of Brazil to the United States and Vice-Chairman of the Government Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).

The debate started along the path of looking for a balance in the multi-dimensional nature between security, privacy, and openness. There was an often expressed

view that that these issues were as complex in nature, as they were important. Also, there was a general feeling that there was no one size fits all solution.

A major theme of the discussion was the tension between rights. Some of the discussion concerned the difficulty that many countries and organizations had in fulfilling the commitments of the UDHR when balancing the needs to protect society against terrorism or pedophilia. It was pointed out that while the rights contained in the UDHR might be a challenge to meet, all countries that have signed it, had the obligation to uphold these rights. Another speaker pointed out that when a criminal used a road to commit a crime, that road would not be closed, but rather would get better lighting.

A few speakers made the point that the discussion should not be about a tension between security and privacy, but the ways in which these could be mutually reinforcing. Further to that, there was some discussion that the tension should be re-conceptualized as a tension between rights and responsibilities, and this also brought into focus the importance of education, and specifically media literacy for users.

Discussions pointed toward an emerging consensus that dealing with cyber-crime, cyber-security, privacy and openness was a joint responsibility of all of the different stakeholders. Much of the discussion made the point that there was need, for more information about where victims of cyber-crimes could go to find a remedy.

The problems were represented as challenges, not only to law enforcement agencies, but also to parliamentarians, to civil society, to intergovernmental organizations, to the private sector and to the technical community. There was a discussion of the different definitions of cyber-security and that law enforcement might not always be the best option, especially when dealing with cases related to the access to information. One of the other considerations concerning the role of law enforcement made by several speakers was that in some cases, law enforcement officers might not be the best solution, as they might be part of the problem rather than the solution. Specific reference was made to repressive states and to situations where the nature of the problem, for example harassment due to gender or gender preference issues, might make the standard law enforcement regimes unhelpful at best. This discussion was connected to the theme that it took the interaction and cooperation of all stakeholders to find solutions.

On child pornography, some people questioned the predominance this topic was taking at this IGF. A number of points were made that this perhaps was not the appropriate space to take up this discussion any further, and that there was need to look at mechanisms, measures, processes, and differences in other spaces where the issue could be addressed more effectively. But the point was also raised that there was a need for a more nuanced debate on questions and definitions such as: what is a child? what is harm? what is harmful content?

There was some feeling in the room that this discussion has matured enough in this area so that now, perhaps, a common environment could be created where all relevant stakeholders could build trust and work together.

While there was some skepticism about whether a decision on solutions could be reached at the IGF, there seemed to be a general feeling that the IGF discussion could bring a better understanding. It was pointed out that there were stakeholders involved in this area who were not part of the debate here. As the discussion moved forward, there was a need to bring those communities, those interested parties, into

the discussion to enrich the debate and to help in understand the implication for other users of some of the measures that were being considered for cyber-security. There was a feeling that whatever the way forward might be, it had to go through the multistakeholder cooperation, dialogue and partnership in the spirit of shared responsibilities. In this regard, it was mentioned that there was still a need of enabling developing countries to fully participate and share their needs, challenges and concerns.

In concluding, it was mentioned that the IGF was not reinventing the wheel: there were relevant references and international norms, like the UDHR, among others, and there were national and regional experiences. It was also concluded that there was a need for a long-term solution, which was not only based on law enforcement but also on the quality of education, devoted to raise consciousness and awareness towards personal empowerment, fulfillment, and above all, happiness.

Managing Critical Internet Resources:

- Transition from IPv4 to IPv6
- Arrangements for Internet Governance: Global, Regional and National

The third day focused on the theme of 'Managing Critical Internet Resources'. The theme was covered in two panel discussions, one on the 'Transition from IPv4 to IPv6', and the second on 'Global, Regional and National Arrangements'. These were followed by an Open Dialogue on the general theme.

Transition from IPv4 to IPv6

The first session was chaired by Dr. Gulsham Rai, Director of the Indian Computer Emergency Response Team (CERT) and was moderated by Ms. Bernadette Lewis, Secretary General of the Caribbean Telecommunication Union (CTU).

Various speakers described the process by which policies that controlled the allocation and management of numbers within the Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) as being developed through an open, bottom-up process that engaged the entire Internet community. This was described as a self-regulating process. Projections were made that at the present rate of depletion, the IPv4 address space, would be exhausted sometime around 2011.

The view was held that there was no need to impose a deadline to forestall the inevitable, because the market was dictating the IPv6 deployment. It was also stated that IPv6 was really a continuation of what existed today in IPv4, except that it would provide additional addresses. This might, however, have impact on some of the current technical processes.

One thing that was considered certain was that IPv4 and IPv6 would coexist well into the future. Every IP-based product was expected to be affected. IPv6 equipment was on the market, and vendors were supporting and migrating applications to IPv6. It was pointed out that even though IPv6 was available for deployment, the operators had been slow on the uptake of IPv6. This was attributed to the number of challenges they were facing, as, for example, there was no obvious commercial driver for network operators to move to IPv6 and that there was no revenue associated with the migration. The point was also made that there was no initial customer demand. Operators were believed to perceive that there was insufficient vendor support. However, it was said that operators were beginning to recognize

that the time for migrating was now and that this was happening incrementally. One speaker explained that there would be a need for addressing hardware and software issues in their customer premise equipment and customer equipment and that there would be costs associated with the migration, costs relating to hardware and software, training, and actual labor costs for doing the conversion.

The panel also noted that there was a great need for private and the public sectors and civil society to be involved in the process. It was a shared responsibility and one that required promotion and enabling of a smooth transition from IPv4 dominance to an environment where IPv6 becomes dominant.

This was seen as a clear case for multistakeholder participation and the Japanese experience was offered as a useful model for going forward, where they used task forces on a national basis to ensure the smooth transition and standardized mechanisms for the coexistence of IPv4 and IPv6.

Others spoke of a tremendous need for public awareness and education, also training. IPv6 needed to be highlighted on the national agendas of all countries. And the speakers mentioned that it would be considered useful if the regions could adopt harmonized approaches. It would be useful and helpful if as part of the education process, case studies were to be made available and published, for example, on the IGF Web site. Confidence-building measures could be highlighted to build the confidence of the citizens so that they would be comfortable with the migration. It was asked how the citizens and other stakeholders could be engaged. This would be very important. One speaker suggested that perhaps citizens should be encouraged, for example, to view an IP address as an integral part of their identity.

In this emergent environment, one panellist indicated that the role of RIRs would be changing. The scarcity of IPv4 was going to demand that the RIRs would look at and develop policies for issues like methodology for the transfer of IP address space, reclaiming and getting control of unused address space, security and management of the new IPv6 addresses, and handling the emergence of possibly secondary markets.

Arrangements for Internet Governance: Global, Regional and National

The second panel discussion, 'Arrangements for Internet Governance: Global, Regional and National', was chaired by Mr. Ramlinga Raju, Founder and Chairman of Satyam Computer Services Limited and moderated by Ms. Emily Taylor, Director of Legal and Policy, Nominet (UK).

The discussion began with a review by the moderator of the origins and the meaning of the terms 'critical Internet resources' and 'enhanced cooperation'. The moderator suggested that for many the term 'critical Internet resources' was understood to mean the administration of the Domain Name System (DNS), Internet Protocol (IP) addresses, which were discussed in the previous session. However, for others, the meaning was broadened by the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG) in 2005 to include also the administration of the root server system, technical standards, peering, and interconnection, telecommunications infrastructure, including innovative and convergent technologies, as well as multilingualization. In her view, there was a broad and a narrow view on the meaning of critical Internet resources.

The representative of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) reported on the progress made in relation to 'enhanced cooperation'. She informed the meeting that the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social

Affairs, Mr. Sha Zukang, had sent letters to relevant organizations to provide an annual performance report, in accordance with the Tunis Agenda. The organizations included the ITU, UNESCO, WIPO, OECD, Council of Europe, ICANN, ISOC, NRO, and W3C.

Information obtained showed a focus on four main areas:

- The meaning of 'enhanced cooperation' to most of the concerned organizations was to facilitate and contribute to multistakeholder dialogue.
- The purpose of such cooperation ranged from information and experience-sharing, consensus-building, fund-raising, to technical knowledge transferring and capacity training.
- Thematic focuses of those arrangements covered by those organizations were very much in line with those being discussed at IGF.
- Cooperative arrangements had already taken place among those organizations, and more were being developed with other partners and with these nine organizations.

She noted that the phrase 'enhanced cooperation' did not seem to provide practical guidance. UNDESA would include a summary of the feedback received in the Secretary-General's report on the follow-up to WSIS which would be submitted to the next meeting of the CSTD in May 2009.

The different speakers shared their understanding of the meaning of the term. One speaker spoke of 'creative ambiguity' that had enabled different stakeholders to discuss a difficult set of issues in ways that were mutually acceptable.

Another panellist emphasized the phrase 'governments, on an equal footing' from paragraph 69 of the Tunis Agenda and that this supported the view that 'enhanced cooperation' meant a process involving governments. This brought a reaction that paragraph 71 of the Tunis Agenda referred to the participation of 'stakeholders in their respective roles'. From their perspective, this supported the position that WSIS created no new areas of competence for existing organizations.

There was an emphasis on 'public policy issues' by one speaker who differentiated between technical policy and public policy. Only 'public policy issues', were part of 'enhanced cooperation'. Other speakers emphasized that the process should involve all stakeholders.

There was uncertainty among the panellists about in what organizations 'enhanced cooperation' should take place: some felt that the ITU was not relevant and ICANN was, others highlighted examples of the OECD and ITU as relevant organizations. One speaker suggested that 'enhanced cooperation' should be understood as a 'living concept'.

The representative of the Government of Brazil said IGOs such as the ITU and UNESCO were promoting 'enhanced cooperation' within their mandates to facilitate the development of public-policy principles at their own pace. In his view, the main reason for the inclusion of 'enhanced cooperation' in the Tunis Agenda was ICANN, because even if ICANN was not for profit, it was market-driven and ICANN was under the oversight of one single government. He noted that governments, in particular from developing countries, were underrepresented in ICANN. The current ICANN Government Advisory Committee arrangements were, in his view, not conducive to 'enhanced cooperation' and needed to be reviewed. He suggested the ICANN transition action plan debate was an opportunity in this regard. He made the

point that ICANN should either be like organizations such as the Internet Engineering Task Force, the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) and the Number Resource Organization (NRO), with no government involvement at all, or like other organizations, such as the ITU or UNESCO, with an intergovernmental structure.

The representative of the United States of America said the Internet in its uses had begun to involve governments, the private sector and civil society in new forms of enhanced cooperation on an unprecedented scale. He added that the IGF was itself a remarkable example of a new enhanced cooperation and underscored the importance of a forum like the IGF, which offered an opportunity for interests with diverse views, which were united by a shared commitment to the constructive evolution of the Internet and its uses. This was the original vision of the Internet and of the IGF that came from the Tunis World Summit on the Information Society in 2005. The IGF would remain vital if it preserved this original vision

All speakers highlighted positive aspects of how discussions about 'enhanced cooperation' were having a positive influence, for example action to combat child abuse images in Brazil, the extended involvement of stakeholders in the recent OECD ministerial meeting, or improvements in the way that IP address registries interacted with relevant stakeholders.

The moderator concluded that the session left Forum participants with a broader understanding of different stakeholder positions on the issues. She suggested that the IGF perhaps had a valuable role as a 'non-threatening environment for discussion', where participants could talk, share practical experiences from different perspectives, and move to the point where people listen to each other, moving from a disconnected series of statements to a shared conversation.

The Chair closed the session with a perspective from the business sector. He described the Internet as a great asset, and that all of us have had a collective responsibility to manage this asset well, because it had the potential to help us eliminate poverty very quickly, address important issues around education, health and a host of other things. The Chair expressed that the collective attempt to bring greater focus on the management of this asset in a cooperative fashion would yield significant results as we moved forward.

Open Dialogue Session

The Open Dialogue was chaired by Mr. Madhusudan Mysore, Chief of Customer Care Operations, Tata Communications and was moderated by Ms. Jeannette Hoffman, Senior Researcher, London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) / Social Science Research Center Berlin and Mr. Chris Disspain, Chief Executive Officer, AU Registry and Chair, Council of Country-Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO).

The session focused on many details that had been broached in the morning meeting and the moderators arranged the session to focus first on issues raised in the session on the 'Transition from IPv4 to IPv6', followed by contributions on 'Global, Regional and National arrangements'. The moderators also made a call for any other issues; any topic on critical Internet resources would be welcomed in the dialogue.

One issue that was discussed was the transition or migration period which required a shared responsibility if it was going to be completed in time. This would require the governments, the operators, the vendors, the consumers, all of them, taking charge

of their respective roles, and a certain coordinated approach to make sure that and orderly migration would happen.

Another extended discussion concerned the risks involved. Some reported that the main risks were not with the technology, but were associated with not moving forward with IPv6 deployment. And, it was said, that in order to minimize this risk, it was important that the planning processes be done very carefully and that all of the issues were taken into consideration.

The need for education and public awareness was also discussed. This was seen as as a shared responsibility that would be fundamental to the whole process moving forward. Governments had a role to play in advising and informing and getting the citizens on board. Furthermore, governments needed to be early adopters of IPv6 and should use it in their own networks as a demonstration of their commitment, and as an encouragement for the business community and the private sector to move forward as well.

There was also a discussion of how to deal with the many IPv4 addresses that were not being used and not accounted for. Some held the view that it was necessary to create a legal market for these addresses so that the sales would not be limited to the black or grey market. Others pointed out that even if these addresses were made available, there was still a need to start the migration process.

The second section of the open dialogue session was devoted to a broad exchange of views on 'enhanced cooperation' and the management of critical Internet resources and also about the role and value of the IGF itself in this discussion. There were some expressions of frustration concerning the IGF and other processes, with frequent references to ICANN by many speakers. A number of speakers emphasized that in processes that were bottom-up and often voluntary, participants needed to be willing to put something in, in order to get something out. This applied not just to ICANN, but also to other processes.

Some speakers considered the IGF itself an example of 'enhanced cooperation'. While some held the view that the IGF was about bringing together different stakeholder points of view across traditional boundaries, others believed that it was about achieving development objectives. A speaker noted that the Tunis Agenda indicated that 'enhanced cooperation' was not about creating new institutions. Speakers also suggested that perhaps it could be a function of the IGF to help reach agreement on what was meant with this term.

Participants discussed the evolution of ICANN, with some expressing frustration about the Government Advisory Committee (GAC), and also about participation and getting involved. However, others remarked that the processes were open and all had the opportunity to contribute and participate.

One speaker recalled the history of the debate on Internet governance since the first phase of WSIS in 2003. In his view, the focus of the IGF should be on how critical resources should be managed. He held the opinion that governments should have the overall responsibility for this task. The IGF should be used to reach consensus on this matter. If the IGF were not able to reach such a consensus, the issue should then be brought to the attention of the General Assembly.

A number of speakers expressed the desire that the United States Government should step down from its pioneer and current role in oversight of critical Internet resources and relationship with ICANN through the Joint Project Agreement (JPA).

They suggested the JPA should not be continued. However, opinions were expressed that some method of accountability should be introduced as a replacement. It was suggested that the IGF could be a space where work could be done to take these ideas forward.

Emerging Issues

The session was entitled 'The Internet of Tomorrow: Innovation and the Evolution of the Internet'. This session was chaired by Mr. S. V. Raghavan, Professor and Chairman, Computer Science Department, IIT, Chennai. The session was moderated by Mr. Jonathan Charles, BBC Foreign Correspondent and News Presenter, and co-moderated by Mr. Stephen Lau, CEO of EDS.

The session was introduced with the goal of addressing topics that had not been discussed in the IGF to date. The moderator asked the participants to propose and discuss issues the IGF should consider in the next year at the IGF in Egypt and beyond. These topics should fit with the five themes of the session:

- The growing popularity of social networks and user-generated content.
- The impact of policy frameworks on creativity and innovation from an entrepreneurial perspective.
- The policy challenges and frameworks in ensuring an 'Internet for All'.
- The impact of the global nature of the Internet on jurisdiction and legislation.
- The policy challenges to providing an environmentally sustainable Internet as the network reached the next billion users.

The moderator also suggested that content would be a big issue, and asked what were the big issues for digital content. Another issue that was brought up was the effect of regulation on the Internet. This was an issue coming to the table in other forums and the IGF should be careful to watch how these discussions developed.

One of the perspectives taken by speakers during the session was to look at the situation with the last billion. What would be the conditions under which the last billion would be added to the Internet community. An issue that was raised concerned the global recession and its effect on reaching the next billion and the billions beyond. Other political trends that were mentioned as having an effect on the Internet included regulation, protectionism and nationalism.

Several speakers mentioned the subject of sustainability, one of the emerging issues brought up in the Rio meeting. A mention was made of the pivotal role of the early Internet of the 1980's in that it allowed researchers to initially realize the effects of global warming. They started using the Internet that was available to them within the university networks to share the data. And it was the possibility of sharing these massive data sets and running these models through the Internet that actually led to the creation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

One analysis that was given included the need for the sustainability issue to move beyond the first order notions of green IT to the second order where the indirect effects were considered. This would concern the role of the Internet community and the ICT community in terms of looking at how they could support other sectors such as energy, transportation, and other civil infrastructure, and how they could help those sectors become far more efficient, and more environmentally sustainable. The analysis continued to a third order that would involve a real transformation of society. The speaker asked the IGF to consider what would happen if we did not respond

correctly to issues of climate change. It was too big and issue to get wrong and the Internet had an essential role to play. To achieve this, the IGF would have to become less self-referential and needed to get involved in making the world more environmentally sustainable.

A speaker recalled the Geneva WSIS Declaration of Principles and the goal to build an inclusive, people-centered information society. The challenge of the next billion and the last billion would be very different from the first. These next and last billions would be more marginalized and include poorer sections of society. It would not be technical issues that would be the key problem. In general, the issues of these next billions would be very different and giving them consideration was an emerging issue and a challenge in itself.

The Chair noted the Forum should consider new pedagogical models; how to teach tens of thousands of people at the same time, utilizing the opportunities if ICTs. We lacked understanding of how to utilize the technology in addressing these issues. Others noted that bandwidth and technology was not an issue, but how they were managed was. Increasingly, networks were available, but they were not affordable and so not accessible to all.

The session was shown a video from the Council of Europe which launched an idea for a new multilateral treaty on certain minimum principles, including positive obligations to ensure the ongoing functioning of the Internet. A new treaty would promote solidarity and cooperation between States and underline the public value of the Internet beyond commercial interests, in full respect of international law, including human rights law. Signing up to a new multilateral treaty which ensured the functioning of the Internet would be of fundamental importance to keep the Internet open and free in the interest of future generations.

One panellist stressed, however, that the IGF should aim to strengthen existing agreements and treaties rather than going down the road of creating yet another treaty. She made the point that there were over 70 multilateral environmental agreements alone. The challenge was not having another treaty, but making existing treaties work. She also argued that the IGF should be considered as a model in itself rather than being sort of a formal structure or treaty-oriented forum. The IGF was a forum that was trying to find a new way of networked governance, soft governance, to come to agreement outside of some of the traditional silos that existed in treaty processes.

The co-moderator gave his reading of the previous days' discussions and, in summarizing the session, noted that sustainability and trust were two essential factors. To reach the next or the last billion, sustainability in terms of access to information, sustainability in terms of respect of the information flow and human dignity was required, as well as sustainability in terms of cybersecurity, privacy and building trust. He identified trust as the key term, without a trusted environment all other issues were much less valuable. The co-moderator also noted the need for breaking out of acting in 'silos' and for communicating with each other. In this way, the IGF could be a portal for such communication.

Reporting Back

Reports were received from a number of regional and national IGF initiatives, other related events, and other meetings that took place during the Hyderabad IGF.

A European Dialogue on Internet Governance (EuroDIG) was held in Strasbourg on 20-21 October 2008. The meeting focused on European perspectives and at the center of discussions was the notion of fostering security, privacy and openness. The meeting wanted to produce some agreed outcome but without negotiating texts, and developed a format with 'Messages from Strasbourg', with reports produced by editors on different topics discussed at the meeting.

The representative of Italy noted the Forum was important not just as an annual event but as a continuous process. Italy organized national IGF consultations in 2007 and 2008, centered on principles of rights on the Internet and offered to convene a meeting of all dynamic coalitions in an event that would be organized in Rome in the middle of next year.

An IGF in the Latin America and Caribbean Region was held in August 2008 in Montevideo. The meeting discussed issues of participation in the IGF process, and also held multistakeholder panel discussions on the main IGF themes.

In the United Kingdom, a national IGF was set up. The UK IGF process put a big emphasis on best practices across all the key IGF issues. It also led to the development of a crime reduction partnership. The speaker noted that perhaps the most significant development in the IGF process in 2008 was the spread of national and regional IGF initiatives.

Two African initiatives were presented: an East African IGF (EAIGF) was held in Nairobi, Kenya, in November as a three-day meeting. The EAIGF brought together outcomes from national meetings held in Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda and Kenya, and online consultations organized by each of the four countries. Another initiative took place in Dakar, Senegal, in October focusing on West African country issues for Internet governance in general and the way forward to IGF. These and other African IGF related events are expected to continue in 2009 in the lead-up to the IGF in Egypt.

The launch of a new Dynamic Coalition of national and regional IGFs was announced.

The Forum heard a report from the dynamic coalition on an Internet Bill of Rights, which held two events in Hyderabad. The coalition has created a new forum for participants from all dynamic coalitions to exchange ideas, discuss and coordinate their interests. The coalition also recommended that principles of rights on the Internet be a major theme for the 2009 IGF meeting.

Organizers of all workshops and other meetings were then reminded that they should file a report of their meeting, and that when allotting slots for meetings next year, those who did not report on their meeting would not be given a slot in 2009.

Taking Stock and the Way Forward

The session was chaired by Mr. Nitin Desai, Special Adviser to the Secretary-General for Internet Governance and Chairman of the Multistakeholder Advisory

Group (MAG). The Chair noted the session should attempt to address three questions.

- First, to consider the IGF itself, the format and modalities of the Forum going forward. The IGF had now reached a stage where participants had to ask themselves what to take away from the IGF. Did the structure and format allow to take away what was needed, bearing in mind that the IGF was not a negotiating forum.
- Second, were there suggestions for the 2009 IGF meeting that the MAG should consider in terms of substance of the agenda.
- And thirdly, consideration should also be given to the review of the desirability to continue the IGF beyond its initial five-year mandate.

There was a general feeling that the IGF had evolved over the past three years. The point was made that to address the needs of the next billions the issues needed to be relevant to them.

Participation was identified a critical issue for the forum by many speakers. These comments linked back to the prior message about the relevance of the Forum's agenda, which should be explained in terms of what were people's primary concerns. Other speakers also noted the challenges of engaging important groups, for example parliamentarians, young people or broadcasters, who had not been widely engaged in the IGF to-date, while also remaining mindful that improving gender balance should be a goal.

It was also noted that the IGF had matured and had become a space where difficult issues could be addressed. The respectful and informed discussion about critical Internet resources that had taken place in Hyderabad was mentioned as an example in this regard. In general, speakers were supportive of IGF's multistakeholder environment, and while some recognized that it meant there would be polemics, the opportunity to learn from each other and share ideas and points of view was valuable. Others noted that increased funding for the IGF was important if it was to be more predictable and viable.

There were references made to the goal of focusing on attempting to narrow differences through discussion and dialog. It was suggested that the philosophy of multistakeholder engagement was finding favour in other processes. Increased comfort with the multistakeholder model was also an output of the IGF.

One speaker mentioned the recent meeting in Rio de Janeiro which resulted in the Rio Pact to prevent and stop sexual exploitation of children, which consisted of a declaration and a plan of action. He mentioned this as an example that it was possible to reach an agreed outcome in a multistakeholder environment, if there was political will to reach meaningful conclusions to tackle problems that were of global importance.

The IGF Secretariat provided an overview of the anticipated schedule for the review of the IGF. The Tunis Agenda asked the UN Secretary-General to make a recommendation to Member States within these five years. This meant that the General Assembly would have to take a decision in this matter at its session in 2010. The report with the recommendations from the Secretary-General needed to be ready in early 2010 so that the General Assembly would be in a position to take a decision. The report would be considered first by the CSTD in May 2010 and then by ECOSOC in July 2010. From ECOSOC the report would go to the General Assembly, which would decide whether or not to continue the forum in December 2010. In order to meet these deadlines, work on the review should therefore begin

early 2009. The review process proper would be brought to fruition at the IGF meeting in Egypt in November 2009.

The Chair, in summing up the session, held the view that the IGF had so far succeeded in reducing people's apprehensions and concerns. There was now a much greater sense of trust. There was a focus on searching for consensus, on trying to narrow differences through the IGF processes of discussion and dialogue, not with the intention that the IGF was going to become a decision-making forum, but that this process of dialogue and discussion helped in reaching decisions elsewhere.

He asked the question whether it would be possible to find consensus in certain well-defined areas where a process had succeeded in narrowing differences. Would it be possible to come up with something, which carried a certain legitimacy because it had come from a broader multistakeholder process in which the people who had ownership were not just governments, but governments, service providers, industry, NGOs, and many others? It might be done only in a few areas, like for example child pornography.

In concluding, the Chair emphasized the uniqueness of the IGF as a multistakeholder space for discussion. The IGF was important because many of the issues that it addressed were not being discussed anywhere else. Segments of the IGF main themes were being discussed elsewhere, but they were not addressed in their totality anywhere else. It was the comparative advantage of the IGF to bring these different threads together. The IGF was discussing terms like 'access', 'diversity', 'security', 'openness', or 'critical Internet resources' not as purely technical issues, but in terms which were more in the province of social, political, or economic analysis. Access for instance could not be discussed as a purely a technical issue. It needed to be addressed like other basic issues of society, of politics, of economics. It was therefore important to fully engage those whose primary interest was the use of the Internet and to say that the issues the IGF was discussing were relevant and salient for the users' interests and concerns. This, incidentally, was how Internet governance was interpreted in the report of the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG), and this was the reason for having the IGF.

Other Events

The issues addressed in the 87 self-organized events taking place in parallel to the main sessions provided an opportunity for meeting participants to share experiences, ideas and best practices. These thematic events, built around the Forum's main themes, discussed specific ideas, heard presentations on successful projects and exchanged views on next steps to address the use and misuse of the Internet.

Following the events in Mumbai, two workshops, two best practice forums and one open forum were cancelled and two workshops merged.

While in general the themes highlighted in these events were fairly diverse, there were a number of events examining different aspects of critical Internet resources. National and regional IGF activities featured prominently, as did issues of protecting children and ensuring a safe online environment. A new issue for the Forum was ICT and climate change.

Of the 87 other events, there were 61 workshops, 9 best practices forums, 10 Dynamic Coalition meetings and 7 open forums. Of the 61 workshops, 8 were devoted to the issue of access, 5 to diversity, 14 to openness, 8 to security, 8 to

critical Internet resources, 11 to development and capacity building, and 7 to other issues.

Reports of these events will be made available on the IGF Web site and all organizers are kindly requested to upload their report on the IGF Web site: www.intgovforum.org.

Closing Session

A common thread throughout all the speeches at the closing session was the recognition that the Hyderabad meeting had been a success and that the IGF had proved its usefulness as a space for multistakeholder dialogue.

The representative of Egypt, H. E. Mohamed Higazy, Ambassador of Egypt to India, announced the date and venue for the 2009 meeting, which would be held in Sharm El Sheikh on 14 – 17 November 2007.

The session also heard comments from representatives from the other stakeholder groups, represented by Mr. Art Reilly, Senior Director, Cisco Systems and ICC/BASIS, Ms. Anita Gurumurthy, Executive Director, IT for Change and Mr. German Valdez, Communications Area Manager at Asia Pacific Network Information Center (APNIC).

On behalf of the Chairman of the Third IGF Meeting, Mr. Jainder Singh, Secretary of the Department of Information Technology in the Ministry for Communications and Information Technology of the Government of India, in his closing remarks expressed the gratitude of the people and the Government of India to all participants for coming to Hyderabad and for participating in the Third Meeting of the Internet Governance Forum. By being in Hyderabad in spite of the terrorist acts in Mumbai, participants had demonstrated their solidarity with the people of India in facing this menace.

He made the point that the Internet today was standing at a threshold, where both limitless opportunities and daunting threats lied ahead. The challenge was to grab the opportunities and exploit them to the fullest while containing, if not eliminating, the threats. It was clear that achieving these objectives would be possible only by concerted and collaborative action by governments, businesses, civil society organizations and academia. The IGF as a forum held great promise as a platform to forge precisely such a grand coalition for universal good.¹

¹ The Chairman's Statement is attached to this document.

Third Internet Governance Forum

Statement by the Government of India at the Closing Session

I speak on behalf of the Chairman of this Internet Governance Forum. Mr A. Raja, Minister for Communications and Information Technology, could not, for many reasons, attend this closing session. It has been India's honour to host the Third Internet Governance Forum in Hyderabad.

From an esoteric communication network connecting a few researchers in the early 1990s, the Internet has today evolved into the veritable bloodstream of modern day life. It encompasses within its fold information, communication and transactions in economic, scientific research, development, governance and other fields. Almost all areas of human endeavour have, to a greater or lesser extent, been impacted by the Internet. Amazingly, despite this, its current impact is still a fraction of what is possible. Progress so far has stirred the imagination of people across the world battling problems of hunger, poverty, disease, lack of education and so on because the Internet has suddenly created avenues for pursuing developmental and economic goals far more efficiently and equitably than was ever possible in the history of mankind. Sadly, the same potential has also attracted the attention of many of the undesirable elements in societies around the world making the Internet both a vehicle and a target of criminal minds. Today therefore, we stand at a threshold where both limitless opportunities and daunting threats lie ahead. The challenge is to grab the opportunities and exploit them to the fullest while containing, if not eliminating, the threats. It is clear that achieving these objectives would be possible only by concerted and collaborative action by governments, businesses, civil society organizations and academia. The IGF as a forum holds great promise as a platform to forge precisely such a grand coalition for universal good.

During the last four days, we have had very fruitful discussions and, with your permission, I would present some closing remarks.

As you are aware, the main focus of this IGF was "Internet for All". The meeting has addressed five main themes: Reaching the Next Billion; Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust; Managing Critical Internet Resources; Taking Stock and the Way Forward; and Emerging Issues – the Internet of tomorrow.

As you are well aware, the Internet Governance Forum has evolved from the Tunis World Summit on Information Society. In this IGF, we were privileged to have extensive participation and involvement of over 12,00 participants from 94 countries representing Government, Private Sector, Civil Society, Academia, Internet Community and Media. This reflects and reiterates the multi-stakeholder and democratic nature of the Forum. During the deliberations and discussions in this IGF, participants exchanged their rich experiences on the developmental and the substantive issues of Public Policy and Governance matters. This has provided an excellent platform to put across the views and suggestions. This helped in moving forward on the issues. Thus, we can see that the IGF is a continuous process where the issues pertaining to Internet and affecting its performance and use are deliberated upon.

As you are aware, our discussions have covered a very broad range of issues related to the growth and governance of the Internet. A host of challenges and

opportunities were identified. It was recognized that there is a need for collaboration between Governments, Private Industry and Civil Society.

In this IGF, we have not only discussed the problems and the opportunities which need to be addressed, but we have also grappled with the question of the right balance between the role of the Markets, the State and Civil Society. What is the role of the State? What is the role of the Private Sector? What is the role of Civil Society? The fundamental approach in this IGF has been - how do we collaborate and ensure complementarity instead of working at cross purposes.

The IGF has held extensive discussions on the main theme of "Internet for All". Nothing could be more important than the ways by which access can be increased to those not yet linked to the Internet.

The Internet is not just about business, but it is also about inclusiveness and empowerment and that depends upon access. There is a need to address the access gap in a multi-dimensional manner. This IGF has discussed all aspects of access - from connectivity to affordability, from physical access to real access and various related issues. Access was discussed with respect to computing facilities and connectivity. It was also recognized that Internet – intermediated services also require to be made available.

Access and Multi-lingualism are inter-twined. We cannot really talk about one without the other. The challenge of achieving universal access can be realized only if the Internet is made available to people of all languages. More vigorous strategies need to be put in place to make sure that the required content is produced. The importance of localization and availability of tools was also discussed. A key point that was recognized was that, increasingly, on-line communication is growing in mediums other than written forms.

During this IGF, there was a focus on inclusion of persons with disabilities so that the required measures can be put into place for making the Internet accessible to them.

Technology experts and also common users are fully aware of the serious and increasing threats to the Internet and the prevalence of Cyber Crimes. The growth of the Internet has created further opportunities for cyber hackers and criminals. Viruses, Spy ware, Phishing and BOTNET are hurdles for the future growth of the Internet. Cyber Security is becoming more and more complex with every advancement of technology. It has perhaps become most serious challenge for all concerned.

There are a large number of actors involved in the prevention and remediation of cyber attacks, who need to collaborate and co-operate. To deal with Cyber Security related challenges, there has to be shared responsibility amongst all stakeholders. Global alliances and mechanisms for exchange of information have to be established for ensuring safety, security, and stability of the Internet. In our deliberations at this IGF, it was felt that a relationship of trust was needed to facilitate discharge of such shared responsibility.

Cyber Security is the key to user's trust in e-business, e-governance, and other on-line applications. The openness and trust of users on the Internet needs to be maintained and encouraged. The fight against Cyber Crimes, therefore, should be given utmost priority in building not only confidence but also User Centric Information Society.

In this IGF, there were discussions about how each of the stakeholders has a role to take appropriate action in areas of privacy and openness.

It is well recognized that the IPv4 address space is limited. The day when no more 32 bit IP network addresses are left will arrive soon. The new IPv6 architecture is designed to solve this address space problem in an effective way. It also supports more features such as secure routing, effective security as well as auto configuration, thereby offering complete mobility. The need for deployment of IPv6 protocol is real and urgent. Because of the huge size and diverse coverage of the Internet, it is not practical to expect a rapid and complete transition from IPv4 – IPv6. Co-existence of both IPv4 and IPv6 must be managed in a practical and simple way for enabling a speedy migration.

The management of the root servers, domain name systems, Internet Protocol and inter-connection points requires the co-operation of all stakeholders. It was seen that there was no clear shared vision of what “Enhanced Co-operation” means and how this has to be worked out. There is, therefore, a need to have a continuing dialogue regarding the management of Critical Internet Resources in order to ensure continuity of a secure and stable Internet infrastructure which has now become essential not only for the economies and security of the developed world but also to enable emerging and developing economies to meet their development goals more effectively. In this context, we see that the dialogue itself serves a very useful purpose as it brings together diverse stakeholders who do not ordinarily meet at a single forum. We also observe that this dialogue has shown the potential to bring greater clarity on the structures that would enable and facilitate the kind of collaboration needed.

Global Internet has thrown up immense opportunities for social benefit as well as extreme challenges in harnessing these opportunities. Governance of such an entity poses challenges for technology, content, and behaviour management coupled with an enhanced understanding of Security in all its dimensions and various aspects of Privacy.

On behalf of the people and the Government of India, I express our gratitude to all of you for coming to Hyderabad and for participating in the 3rd Internet Governance Forum. By being here in spite of the terrorist acts in Mumbai, you have demonstrated your solidarity with the people of India in facing this menace. I would like to thank you and convey that your presence here means a lot to us.

I would also like to thank Mr K S Jomo, Asst. Secretary General for Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations for his personal contribution to IGF 2008. I am sure you will all join me in thanking Mr Nitin Desai, Mr Markus Kummer and the Staff of the United Nations who not only prepared so carefully for the IGF, but also ensured the smooth and successful conduct of this IGF at Hyderabad. I would also like to recognize the unstinted support given by the Internet Community in India.

Thank you very much to all of you.

** * * * **

ANNEX

LIST OF SPEAKERS

Opening Ceremony

Wednesday, 3 December 2008, 1400 - 1430

Mr. Jomo Kwame Sundaram
Assistant Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA)

Mr. Nitin Desai
Special Adviser to the Secretary-General for Internet Governance and
Chairman of the Multi stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG)

H.E. Mr. Damodar Reddy
Minister for IT, Government of Andhra Pradesh

H.E. Mr. Thiru Andimuthu Raja
Union Cabinet Minister for Communications & Information Technology,
Government of India

Opening Session

Wednesday, 3 December 2008, 1430 - 1530

Mr. Jainder Singh,
Secretary, Department of Information Technology, Ministry for Communications &
Information Technology, Government of India

Mr. Subramaniam Ramadorai
CEO and Managing Director, Tata Consultancy Services Ltd (TCS); Chairman,
ICC/BASIS

Ms. Lynn St. Amour
CEO, Internet Society (ISOC)

Ms. Alice Munyua
Alice Munyua, Coordinator, Kenya ICT Action Network (KICTANet), and
Director, Communications Commission of Kenya (CCK)

Mr. Abdul Waheed Khan
Assistant Director General, United Nations Educational, Scientific & Cultural
Organization (UNESCO)

Ms. Meredith Attwell Baker
Acting Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information and
National Telecommunications and Information Administration Administrator,
United States of America

Mr. Paul Twomey
CEO and President, Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)

Ms. Graciela Selaimen
Executive Coordinator, Núcleo de Pesquisas, Estudos e Formação da Rits
(Nupef/Rits)

Mr. Hamadoun Touré
Secretary-General, International Telecommunication Union (ITU)

Main Sessions:

Wednesday, 3 December 2008

Reaching the Next Billion

Realizing a Multilingual Internet, 09:30 - 11:00

Chair: Mr. Ajit Balakrishnan, Chief Executive Officer, Rediff.Com

Moderator: Ms. Miriam Nisbet, Director, Information Society Division, UNESCO

Panellists:

- Mr. Alex Corenthin, NIC SN (Senegal), President of ISOC Senegal and lecturer at a Polytechnic Institute of the Cheik Anta Diop University of Dakar (Ecole Supérieure Polytechnique)
- Ms. Manal Ismail, GAC member, Egypt
- Mr. Hiroshi Kawamura, President, Daisy Consortium
- Ms. Viola Krebs, MAAVA, ICTV
- Ms. Tulika Pandey, Additional Director, Department of Information Technology, Ministry for Communications & Information Technology, Government of India
- Mr. S. Ramakrishnan, CEO of the Centre for Development of Advanced Computing (C-DAC), India

Access: Reaching the Next Billions, 11:00 - 12:30

Chair: Mr. Kiran Karnik, Founder-Director of ISRO's Development and Educational Communicational Unit

Moderator: Ms. Anriette Esterhuysen, Executive Director, Association for Progressive Communications (APC)

Panellists:

- Mr. Rajnesh Singh, Regional Bureau Manager for South and Southeast Asia, Internet Society (ISOC)
- Mr. Shri S.K. Gupta, Advisor (CN), Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI)
- Ms. Jacquelynn Ruff, Vice President, International Public Policy and Regulatory Affairs, Verizon
- Ms. Peter H. Hellmonds, Head of Corporate Social Responsibility, Corporate Affairs Division, Nokia Siemens Networks
- Ms. Alison Gillwald, Director of Research, ICT Africa
- Mr. Brian Longwe, Chief Executive Officer InHand Limited, Director, African Internet Service Providers Association (AfriSPA), Board member of African Network Information Centre (AfriNIC)

Open Dialogue: Reaching the Next Billion

Chair: Mr. B. K. Gairola, Director General NIC, Government of India

Moderator: Mr. Hidetoshi Fujisawa, Chief Commentator and Programme Host, Japan Broadcasting Corporation (NHK)

Co-moderators:

Ms. Alison Gillwald, Director of Research, ICT Africa

Mr. Patrick Fältström, Consulting Engineer, Cisco Systems; Member, Board of Internet Society; Member, Swedish Government IT Advisory Group

Thursday, 4 December 2008

Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust

The Dimensions of Cyber-security and Cyber-crime: A Mapping of Issues and our Current Capabilities, 09:30 - 11:00

Chair: Mr. Rentala Chandershekhar, Special Secretary, Department of Information Technology, Ministry of Communications & Information Technology, Government of India

Moderator: Mr. Bertrand de la Chapelle, Government of France

Panellists:

- Mr. Patrik Fältström, Cisco
- Mr. Marc Goodman, International Multilateral Partnership Against Cyber Terrorism
- Mr. Alexander Ntoko, ITU
- Mr. Michael Lewis, Deputy Director, Q-CERT, USA
- Mr. Gulshan Rai, Director, CERT-IN, Government of India
- Mr. Jayantha Fernando, Director and Legal Adviser, Information and Communication Technology Agency (ICTA), Sri Lanka

Fostering Security, Privacy and Openness, 11:00 - 12:30

Chair: Mr. Shyamai Ghosh, Chairman, Data Security Council of India (DSCI)

Moderator: Ambassador David A. Gross, U.S. Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy

Panellists:

- Mr. Abdul Waheed Khan, Assistant Director General for Communication and Information, UNESCO
- Mr. Stefano Rodotà, Professor, University La Sapienza, Rome
- Mr. John Carr, Secretary of Children's Charities' Coalition on Internet Safety (CHIS)
- Ms. Jac SM Kee, Association for Progressive Communications (APC)
- Mr. Joseph Alhadeff, Vice-President, Global Public Policy and Chief Privacy Officer, Oracle

Open Dialogue: Promoting Cyber-Security and Trust

Co-Chairs:

Mr. Pavan Duggal, President of Cyberlaws.Net

Mr. Gulshan Rai, Director CERT-In

Moderator: Mr. Jonathan Charles, BBC Foreign Correspondent and News Presenter

Co-moderators:

Ms. Natasha Primo, National ICT Policy Advocacy Coordinator for the Association for Progressive Communications

Mr. Everton Lucero, Counselor for Science and Technology at the Embassy of Brazil to the United States and Vice-Chairman of the Government Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)

Friday, 5 December 2008

Managing Critical Internet Resources

Transition from IPv4 to IPv6, 09:30 - 11:00

Chair: Mr. Gulshan Rai

Moderator: Ms. Bernadette Lewis, Secretary General, Caribbean Telecommunication Union (CTU)

Panellists:

- Mr. Adiel Akplogan, CEO, AfriNIC/NRO
- Mr. Kurtis Lindqvist, Netnod
- Mr. Milton Mueller, Professor, Syracuse University / Internet Governance Project
- Mr. Satoru Yanagishima, Director of Internet Policy, Ministry of Communications, Government of Japan
- Mr. Jonne Soininen, Nokia
- Ms. Tulika Pandey, Additional Director, Department of Information Technology, Ministry for Communications and Information Technology, Government of India

Global, Regional and National Arrangements, 11:00 - 12:30

Chair: Mr. Ramlinga Raju, Founder and Chairman of Satyam Computer Services Limited

Moderator: Ms. Emily Taylor, Oxford - Nominet (UK), Director of Legal and Policy

Panellists:

- Ms. Haiyan Qian, Acting Director, Division for Public Administration and Development Management, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA)
- Mr. Everton Lucero, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brazil
- Mr. Richard Beard, Department of State, USA
- Mr. Parminder Singh, IT for Change
- Mr. Byron Holland, President and CEO, Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA)
- Mr. Raúl Echeberria, CEO, LACNIC

Open Dialogue: Managing Critical Internet Resources

Chair: Mr. Madhusudan Mysore, Chief of Customer Care Operations, Tata Communications

Co-moderators:

Ms. Jeannette Hoffman, Senior Researcher, London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) / Social Science Research Center Berlin

Mr. Chris Disspain, Chief Executive Officer, AU Registry; Chair, Council of Country-Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)

Saturday, 6 December 2008

Emerging Issues - the Internet of Tomorrow

The Internet of Tomorrow: Innovation and the evolution of the Internet, 10:00 - 12:00

Chair: Mr. S. V. Raghavan, Professor and Chairman, Computer Science Department, IIT, Chennai

Moderator: Mr. Jonathan Charles, BBC Foreign Correspondent and News Presenter

Co-Moderator: Mr. Stephen Lau, CEO EDS

Panellists:

- Mr. Herbert Heitmann, Head of Global Communications, SAP AG
- Mr. Ian Peter, Internet Governance Caucus co-coordinator, Ian Peter and Associates
- Ms. Heather Creech, Director, Global Connectivity Programme, International Institute for Sustainable Development

Taking Stock and the Way Forward, 14:00 - 16:00

Chair: Mr. Nitin Desai, Special Adviser to the Secretary-General for Internet Governance and Chairman of the Multi stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG)

Panellists:

- Mr. Jeff Brueggeman, Vice-President, Public Policy, AT&T
- Ms. Katitza Rodriguez, Electronic Privacy Information Center & DiploFoundation Associate
- Mr. Georges Papadatos, Permanent Mission of Greece in Geneva

- Mr. N. Ravi Shanker, IAS Joint Secretary, Department of Information Technology, Ministry for Communications & Information Technology, Government of India

Closing Session

Mr. Nitin Desai
Special Adviser to the Secretary-General for Internet Governance and
Chairman of the Multi stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG)

Mr. Art Reilly
Senior Director, Cisco Systems, ICC/BASIS

Ms. Anita Gurumurthy
Executive Director, IT for Change

Mr. German Valdez
Communications Area Manager at Asia Pacific Network Information Center (APNIC)

H. E. Mr. Mohamed Higazy
Ambassador of Egypt to India

Mr. Jainder Singh,
Secretary, Department of Information Technology, Ministry for Communications and
Information Technology, Government of India.