IGF 2013 Bali
Internet Governance Forum in Bali

- The Internet Governance Forum (IGF) is a multi-stakeholder dialogue on the issues and policies of Internet governance

- 1/3 > government, 1/3 < civil society, 1/3 > technical community & private sectors
- A lot of focus on cyber security and surveillance
Overview

- Over 130 workshops, 11 parallel sessions
- Transcripts
- Main Hall had focus session everyday
  - Surveillance, cyber security, role of government in multi-stakeholder engagement, etc

General Info:
22-25th Oct 2013 – Pre-event on 21st
Over 1,500 participants, 111 economies
Main Theme: “Building Bridges – Enhancing Multi-stakeholder Cooperation for Growth and Sustainable Development”
Notable Announcements/Introductions at the IGF

- The Montevideo Statement referred
- Brazil’s CGI.br model, Brazil Meeting
- Swedish government – principles on surveillance
- Discussions on AP I* Collaboration (not an announcement)

... and 20-30% traffic at the IGF venue was IPv6

- Government officials who spoke all expressed support for the multistake holder engagement
- A lot of referral about the Brazil Meeting
INTERNET GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES

- Globalization of internet governance principles and defining a process to do this

- General agreement but concerned that it may lead to the lowest common denominator, and commitments to the principles must also be debated to be effective

- Russia and ISOC expressed IGF to be the best place
THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENTS IN MULTISTAKEHOLDER COOPERATION

What role is appropriate for Governments in the multistakeholder environment of cyberspace

- US, Brazil, AT &T, Jari Akko(Chairman, IETF), Civil Society (Independent Research Consultant)

Background

- Proposal from Brazil at the World Telecommunication Policy Forum (WTPF) in May 2013 “Draft Opinion on the Role of Governments in Multistakeholder Cooperation.”
THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENTS IN MULTISTAKEHOLDER COOPERATION

- Government considers themselves as one of the stakeholders

- If what is illegal offline is also illegal online, then what happens when countries have different customs and different laws?

- “How can governments be integrated in self-regulatory Internet bodies so that their concerns are heard and possibly mitigated, without impeding on the economic development and freedom of information flows?”
LEGAL AND OTHER FRAMEWORKS: SPAM, HACKING AND CYBERCRIME

CERTS

- Having national level CERTS co-operating with other CERTS in the world is important
- Encourage CERTS to be a member of FIRST to effectively collaborate from a global perspective

Important to have different parts of your local government working together

- including the technical community, law enforcement, and the policy community

Important to have diplomatic channel to ask for support outside your country

- Budapest Convention addresses consistency and allows much better cooperation on cybercrime
EMERGING ISSUES – INTERNET SURVEILLANCE

- US, Sweden, Jari Akki (Chairman, IETF), Google

- Human rights and privacy should be tolerated
- Sweden – has acts on human rights
- Transparency about information you collect and share with others are important
General Impressions

- All governments who spoke emphasized the importance of multi-stakeholder engagement.
- Governments say collaborating with technical communities are important.
- US government officials stated they tolerate privacy of individual citizens, considers participation at the IGF important.
- ISOC and the I* organizations, speakers from the technical community represented the positions very clearly.

However...There are still issues to be discussed.
Some more issues for discussions

- Multi stakeholder engagement
  - Everyone agrees it is important—but how? Some feel the current IGF model itself is not good enough

- Cyber security
  - Upto where is who’s role
  - What are the legislation which reflects the reality of the operations

- Surveillance
  - what is acceptable as a part of addressing criminal actions and what is not?
  - Transparency – how do you define it
  - What is the information which is should be provided to law enforcement agencies and what is not
Observations

- A lot of efforts by the I* in explaining positions at the IG related meetings
- Having a specific model/document helps in reference and getting attention
- Many good technical knowledge and practices are within the minds of the people and not fully effectively utilized
- Potentials for widening gaps in keeping up to date between governments and private sectors
What may be helpful

- Facilitation of community’s expertise
  - Develop paper which describes reality of the operations, services, technologies? Help facilitate research projects?
  - How can we do this effectively?

- Is there a way for ISOC to engage its chapters in outreaching the issues within their regions?

- More issue based information sharing
ICANN related updates
ICANN’s activities

- Stakeholder engagement
- Hubs in three locations, covering each region
- “DNS Industry” engagement
- New gTLDs
- WHOIS review

UNESCO, ICANN and ISOC to Launch Development of Glossary on Internet Governance for Arabic Speakers
5 Year Strategic Plan Panel

- Identifier Technology Innovation: Paul Mockapetris
- ICANN Multistakeholder Innovation: Beth Simone Noveck
- Public Responsibility Framework: Nii Quaynor
- ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem: Vinton Cerf
New gTLDs

- Delegations of the new gTLDs started
  - 4 IDNs, 9 more approved this week
- Dotless domain – prohibited
- Name Collisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 Rank</th>
<th>2012 Rank</th>
<th>String</th>
<th>Count (thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>home</td>
<td>952,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>corp</td>
<td>144,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>ice</td>
<td>19,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>12,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>med</td>
<td>10,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>10,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ads</td>
<td>10,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>network</td>
<td>8,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>group</td>
<td>8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>cisco</td>
<td>8,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>box</td>
<td>7,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>prod</td>
<td>7,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>iinet</td>
<td>5,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>hsbc</td>
<td>5,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>inc</td>
<td>5,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reference

- "Addressing the Consequences of Name Collisions"

- Dotless domain
  - Use of Dotless Domain Name Prohibited
Q&A