IGF 2013 Bali

JP
NIC 社団法人 日本ネットワークインフォメーションセンター

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
  - ➢ http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-2013-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 multistakeholder engagement
- ☐ A lot of referrals 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
  ➢ UK, 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."

5

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENTS IN MULTISTAKEHOLDER COOPERATION

- ☐ Government considers themselves as one of the stakeholders
  - ➤ Brazil does not see a contradiction between increased government involvementand the multistakeholder model
  - ➤ UK –government intervention is not the same as government control
- ☐ 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 economicdevelopment and freedom of information flows?"

LEGAL AND OTHER FRAMEWORKS: SPAM, HACKING AND CYBERCRIME

◻ Host country Chair, Srilanka, US, ISOC, Security Consultant

◻ CERTS
  ➢ Having national level CERTS co-operating with other CERTS in the world is important
  ➢ Encourge 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 communit

◻ 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-stake holder 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

Q&A