

The multiple faces of Internet governance

Preliminary analysis of the regional and national IGF initiatives

DRAFT: A thought document prepared by Dmitry Epstein, PhD

Introduction

The phenomenal growth and wide-spread adoption of the Internet on a global scale, have posed new challenges to policymakers worldwide. Internet Governance Forum (IGF), one of the main outcomes of the World Summit on Information Society (WSIS), is a unique experiment in international Internet diplomacy.¹ At the core of the IGF lies the understanding that the multifaceted nature of Internet-related policy issues, requires cooperation across traditional stakeholder lines. Thus, multistakeholderism emerged as one of the key operational principles of the IGF, along with openness and inclusivity of the deliberative process hosted at the forum. The multistakeholder approach, however, is not uniformly accepted by participants in the Internet governance space, many of whom see the sovereign state as the primary and sole decision-making authority, which has exposed the IGF model to substantive criticism. Although the IGF has no decisionmaking authority, it continues to attract high-level participants, who meet to discuss existing and emerging Internet-related policy issues on an equal footing. Policy issues range from the management of critical Internet resources, to protection of human rights online, to the role of the Internet in socioeconomic development.

The emergence of regional and national IGF initiatives, or regional and national IGFs as they are commonly referred to, is the single most tangible outcome of the global IGF.² This series of meetings and discussions is enjoying significant growth and there is an increasing number of voices calling for systematic examination of this phenomenon. Such examination will add to the repertoire of perspectives examining the IGF and the multistakeholder model; at the same time it might also help establishing a more meaningful connection between the regional/national initiatives and the global IGF.

This preliminary report is the first instance in an effort to carry out systematic review of regional and national IGFs in light of the values, principles, and practices of the global IGF, as well as substantive global debates surrounding Internet-related policy. The full study will aim to cover the entire universe of existing initiatives and offer best practices of organizing such policy deliberation events. The current report offers an initial, limited review and suggests a framework for comparative analysis of regional and national initiatives. It is based on a number of face-to-face interviews with organizers of regional and national IGFs and on inductive reading of formal reports from regional and national IGFs that took place in 2012.

¹ For a detailed historical account of the IGF formation, see: Mathiason, J. (2009). *Internet Governance: The new frontier of global institutions*. New York, NY: Routledge.

² For a more detailed discussion about potential impacts of the global IGF see: Diplo Foundation. (2009). *Internet Governance Forum: Identifying impact*. Msida, Malta. Retrieved from <http://www.diplomacy.edu/ig/impact/>

This preliminary report is not an attempt to evaluate the various regional and national initiatives. Instead it is an attempt to begin charting the emerging landscape of IGF-inspired multistakeholder discussions of Internet-related public policy across the globe. Its primary goal is to feed both the discourse about and the discourse of the regional and national initiatives during the IGF event as well as outside of the IGF context. Its secondary goal is being a building block towards a more robust documentation and analysis of the emerging models for Internet-related policy deliberation.

Letting a thousand flowers bloom

According to the records available on the website of the global IGF, there were a total of at least 38 regional and 73 national IGF meetings since 2009 alone. Some of those initiatives have persisted over time; others seem to be one-time events. The IGF secretariat started formally keeping track of the regional and national initiatives in preparation for the 2010 meeting of the IGF (thus accounting for the state of affairs in 2009). At that point (i.e. in 2009), there were eight regional and 14 national initiatives. Since then, the number of regional IGFs first climbed up to 12 in 2011 and then stabilized at nine in 2012 (see Table 1); the number of national initiatives has steadily climbed until it reached 23 in 2011 and then dropped to only 16 in 2012 (see Table 2). In the last few years we also see an emergence of a series of youth-focused IGF initiatives.

There is no clear definition of what constitutes an event that qualifies being included in the family of IGF events. So there are additional IGF-related or IGF-inspired initiatives that are not documented by the IGF secretariat at all, as well as some that have been in existence for some time now, but have not been formally mentioned on the IGF website. In other words, the phenomenon of regional and national IGFs is probably wider than what is captured on the website of the global IGF.

In 2012 the secretariat of the global IGF introduced a series of reporting criteria for regional and national IGF initiatives to be listed on the website of the global IGF. The required criteria include “(1) a report of past activities indicating the members of the initiative, (2) a list of members or main organizers comprising at least three representatives of different stakeholder groups, and (3) a dedicated webpage or website, with a contact person and a working email address.”³ Introduction of these criteria may account for some of the fluctuation in the total number of regional and national meetings recorded on the website of the global IGF.

In addition to the growing number of regional and national IGF initiatives, there is a trend towards “institutionalization” of the regional and national voices within the global IGF. Starting in 2010, there was some experimentation with weaving links to the regional and national initiatives into the program of the global IGF. Those ranged from workshops organized by or dedicated to particular initiatives to inter-regional dialogue sessions. Today, there is a functioning dedicated mailing list for facilitators of regional and national IGFs and there are expanding attempts to coordinate among the facilitators, as well as efforts at self evaluation.

³ See <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf-initiatives> (as of September 20, 2013).

The meeting in Bali will have a “National and Regional IGF ‘Track’” on the day immediately preceding the opening of the main events, in addition to a number of Inter-regional dialogues dedicated to discussions among participants active in regional and national initiatives throughout the global IGF.⁴

The bird-eye view

What do the regional and the national IGFs look like? The reporting requirements posed by the IGF secretariat created a pool of information that allows initial mapping of the themes and, to a very limited degree, practices of the regional and national initiatives. The reporting requirements are rather broad, which results in reports that vary in scope, detail, and form. The secretariat is asking the organizers of regional and national IGFs to include in their reports information about the organizational processes of putting a consultation together (with an emphasis on how the multistakeholder model is maintained), agenda of the event and statistics about attendance. Some reports offer detailed accounts of those elements, while others are not as thorough, which makes it difficult to draw a uniform picture of the preparatory processes or the ways in which the multistakeholder model is maintained.

It is important to remember that the reports, posted on the IGF website, were written for a particular purpose and as such draw a partial picture of the phenomenon. They tell little in terms of the nature of engagement in the regional and national IGF initiatives⁵ or about the practices underlying the organization of these events and their agenda setting. To complement this information, I rely on a small number of in-depth interviews conducted with a few facilitators of regional and national IGFs.⁶ These interviews give a flavor of what the backstage processes leading to regional and national IGFs may look like. In some aspects, these processes are very similar, but in other they are very distinct.

Format

Table 3 and Table 4 aggregate the key information available in the 2012 batch of reports.⁷ Most of the documented events in 2012 followed one of the three nominal models. The most common model includes face-to-face, conference-style meetings, which runs for one day (with some meetings extending to as many as 3) and includes formal sessions with speakers aiming to represent diverse stakeholder groups (e.g. African IGF, EuroDIG, Uganda IGF). Another involves

⁴ See http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1352&Itemid=441 (as of October 18, 2013).

⁵ Very few reports include participation numbers. In the rare cases when such numbers are included, it is typically an aggregate number and it is impossible to know the degree of diversity within that group.

⁶ At the basis of this brief are interviews with the organizers of 4 national and 4 regional IGFs.

⁷ In 2013 all but one out of nine regional initiatives had reports available on the website of the global IGF (the report from Pacific IGF is missing); 10 out of the 16 national initiatives had reports available on the website of the global IGF (missing reports from Canada IGF, Kenya IGF, Malta IGF, Portugal IGF, Russia IGF, and IGF USA); as well as both of the Youth IGFs. Two of the national reports (Central Africa and Cote d'Ivoire) were in French and thus excluded from the current review. One report (German IGF) was in fact report from the German Youth IGF, which took place prior to the national IGF.

a much smaller-scale meeting, typically hosted in the office of a relevant government official (e.g. Bangladesh IGF).

My interviews suggest that the choice of the former, more common, format is driven by treating the global IGF as a blueprint for what a multistakeholder discussion of Internet-related policy issues might look like. The choice of the latter format is typically driven by practical constraints, such as space and time limitations. Cultural characteristics also play a role in shaping how much interaction there is in the different sessions. Whereas in the global IGF the UN culture of diplomatic exchange typically dominates the deliberative practices, in regional and national IGFs, there is more room for local cultures to influence the flow of the conversation.

The Commonwealth IGF is the only initiative with a substantively different model. It is run as an online platform for disseminating information about the IGF and Internet governance, and it also serves as a space for discussion, collaboration, and coordination among actors involved with the Commonwealth. Such different format stems from a different role the facilitators of the Commonwealth IGF envision for their initiative. The main distinction seems to be viewing the goal of the IGF to be an ongoing deliberative process as opposed to a deliberative event. Although the Commonwealth IGF also includes physical meetings, they do not seem to have the same weight (symbolically and logically) as the annual events organized by the majority of the IGF initiatives.⁸

Organization

One of the main principles that both regional and national IGF initiatives are constantly emphasizing is the multistakeholder as the core of their organizational principle. Similarly to the global IGF they strive to demonstrate multistakeholderism in every aspect of the event, including both decisionmaking and funding. Launching a regional or national IGF requires idea champions, who got exposed to the global IGF, and gained support of institutional players. So, in practice, most initiatives have an organization core with the champion's organization, typically a government or a civil society body, but regardless of that core, there is a conscious effort to perform multistakeholderism in every aspect of the endeavor.

Those initiatives that have mentioned their decision-making processes in their report always emphasize the multistakeholder nature of the actors involved. Not all stakeholder groups are always represented, but there is a conscious attempt to have at least nominal representation for the classic Internet governance stakeholder groups. In many cases the initiative seems to stem from a government agency, but even then there is a strong emphasis on engaging other stakeholders in the shaping of the agenda. For example, the Arab IGF, which originated and received its legitimacy from within an intergovernmental regime, has modeled its decision-making process after the global IGF, including having a MAG-like body that works through open consultations.

Information on funding of the IGF initiatives is scarce. My interviewees have estimated the cost of a typical IGF initiative arranged around an annual event with broad public participation at

⁸ Canada IGF seems to move in the same direction by maintaining a website for continuous engagement with the public.

around USD 100K to 300K, although no one provided an exact figure. On the IGF website, only few initiatives (e.g. Asia Pacific IGF) explicitly list their donors. Most other reports talk in terms of partnership and support. Indeed, a significant portion of the cost is covered through in-kind donations, but hosting a large public and open event is a costly endeavor. Where partners are listed most of them seem to come from the government sector, with fewer coming from the private sector or from traditional Internet organizations such as ISOC. Moving on, it will be important to identify or develop sustainable funding models to support distributed multistakeholder policy deliberation on both the regional and the national levels.

Participation

Participation in the IGF comes in two flavors – as a speaker or discussion conveyor, or as a participant from the floor. Assessing the latter with currently existing data is practically impossible. Only a few initiatives report their total attendance numbers, but most do not share that information. To assess the scope and the diversity of engagement a more detailed data collection needs to occur at the time of the events themselves.

With regards to the composition of the panels it is hard to establish from the reports the degree to which the multistakeholder approach was enacted. In most cases, the organizers report representation of all the main stakeholder groups typically mentioned in relation to the multistakeholder approach in Internet governance, namely representatives of government, civil society, private sector, technical, and academic communities. Since the level of detail of reports varies substantively, there is no comprehensive picture available just yet. With that, one may notice that in some cases the academic community is under-represented in both the regional and national IGF initiatives. A more detailed analysis of the lists of speakers is required in order to draw a more precise picture of the multistakeholder model as it is enacted through the composition of the panels at regional and national IGFs.

In reports that provide information about speakers, one can see names of individuals active in the global IGF, being also active in regional and national events. In other words, the nucleus of idea entrepreneurs from the global IGF is also active in, and in some case leading, the regional and national initiatives.⁹ At the same time, it is clear that both regional and national events bring new individuals into the Internet governance discussion. This dynamic is similar to the dynamic observed in the global IGF, where location of the event influences the mix of participants, giving an advantage to local participants and amplifying the voice of local activist groups in a country where the IGF is hosted. Verbal accounts from the organizers support an observation that there is limited overlap in speakers at the global and the regional or national events. The question remains whether those speakers bring in new perspectives.

Agenda

Thematically, some of the initiatives, particularly the younger ones seemed to mirror the general agenda of the global IGF, adopting the same general structure and titles for the sessions. In fact, most available agendas suggest a variation of the themes discussed at the

⁹ I discuss the idea of the IGF nucleus in “Manufacturing Internet Policy Language: The Inner Workings of the Discourse Construction at the Internet Governance Forum,” paper presented at TPRC 2011.

global IGF.¹⁰ One common strategy is discussing an IGF theme in the context of a particular country or a region. The local realities are reflected in agendas not only through contextualizing of global Internet-related policy issues, but also in the salience of particular themes or particular framing of the issues. Thus for example, there is more discussion of the link between Internet governance and development in developing countries, whereas there is more discussion of human rights and civil liberties in developing countries. There is no well established single practice for determining the agenda. In the larger events, the organizers try to go through a formal proposal solicitation process, similar to the one practiced at the global IGF. In the smaller events, the consultations are often less formal.

The unique topics discussed at the regional or national IGFs are particularly interesting as tracing those over time may teach us about the dynamics of policy agenda setting between the global and the more local levels. Thus, for example, a number the African regional IGFs explicitly focused on the discussion of International Telecommunication Regulations (TRS), which came out of recently, at the time, completed World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT); the Arab IGF focused on discussion of youth in the online world in light of the Arab spring; and Eurodig included explicitly European topics such as the changing nature of European democracy and social inclusivity. In national IGFs we see more emphasis on capacity building, which is manifested through more introductory sessions that explain Internet governance the history of that process. A more detailed analysis of the substance of the discussions, beyond the titles and descriptions of the sessions, is needed in order to have a clearer picture not only of what topics are relevant to those geo-political settings, but also how participants in regional and national IGFs frame the policy issues in hand.

The reports suggest that the regional and national fora serve a variety of different functions for their conveyors. While some initiatives are viewed as capacity building and knowledge exchange events (e.g. Eurodig) other frame themselves more as coordinating events aimed at preparing a position of a country (e.g. Nigerian IGF) or a region (e.g. African IGF) for participation in the global IGF event. While the reports from coordinating events highlight the value of exchange of opinions and contributions by the multiple participating stakeholder groups, they often appear as more top down initiatives as opposed to events focused on capacity building and cross-fertilization as their main goal. Yet, in and of itself, the emergence of a coordination mechanism for national or regional actors is a function of capacity building as well. Some reports of the regional events tend to portray the terrain of regional and national IGF initiatives in hierarchical terms, which typically is not the case with reports from the national initiatives. There are also initiatives that strive to combine the two aspirations to coordinate and educate (e.g. Commonwealth, EuroDIG) or have evolved to combine the two (e.g. Asia Pacific IGF).

¹⁰ Typically, a global IGF has five fixed themes (Access and Diversity; Security, Openness and Privacy; Managing Critical Internet Resources; Emerging Issues; and Taking Stock and the Way Forward) and one theme that is changing from year to year (e.g. Social Networks). Recently, the theme of Internet Governance for Development (IG4D) has established itself as another more or less permanent theme on the agenda of the global IGF.

Connection to the global IGF

The reports also highlight the pivotal role of the global IGF in both spurring and shaping the regional and national initiatives. This may be driven by the fact that the authors of the reports view the global IGF community as their main audience. Nevertheless a few trends are noteworthy. First, the global IGF is a major organizing factor – the scheduling of the regional and national events is orchestrated around the events of the global IGF. Second, as it is mentioned above, many IGFs, particularly at the national level, adopt the general thematic framework of the global IGF. Third, the events are typically presented in relation to the global IGF, i.e. the global event is a source of legitimacy, particularly for the national-level initiatives. Finally, most of the reports, when describing their events, emphasize values that have become strongly associated with the global IGF process, such as multistakeholderism, openness, and inclusivity.

Similarly, the interviewees have also emphasized the influence of the global IGF in terms of the agenda setting and offering models of multistakeholder cooperation. At the very least it offers a blueprint for acceptable multistakeholder practices. At the most, it can be used as a definitive guide. The growing institutionalization of reporting and collaboration mechanisms for regional and national IGFs within the global event, also add a sense of framework and simultaneously both provide the regional and national initiatives with legitimacy and imply a hierarchical relationship between them and the global event.

Open questions

Overall, we are facing here a rather young, and experimental in nature, phenomenon. This preliminary review makes a few observations and raises a series of questions that may guide both, future research of the regional and national IGF initiatives as well practical discussions among the facilitators of those initiatives about the future of this movement.

1. The number of regional IGF initiatives seems to stabilize, but the number of national initiatives can be expected to continue to fluctuate. It appears that policymakers are willing to experiment with the new format for policy deliberation. The question now becomes whether these experiments will be filled with substance or will be empty performances of nominal multistakeholderism. There is an emerging body of research that offers an optimistic outlook, suggesting that practices, values, and issues that travel through the IGF networks have a real impact on local policymaking activities.¹¹ Despite this cautious optimism, I would argue that this will be one of the main issues to monitor in the years to come.
2. The emerging pattern of regional and national IGFs is that of a network with a group of idea entrepreneurs acting as links between the various geo-politically distinct fora for Internet-related policy deliberation. Here, given the purely deliberative nature of the IGF network, one question is how does this network link to the decision-making

¹¹ Brandie Martin Nonnemecke has recently completed a dissertation where she offers an in-depth analysis of the East Africa IGF and explores potential causal relationships between debates in the IGF and local policy discourses.

networks such as intergovernmental organizations, national governments, standard setting bodies, and private entities with significant impact on the Internet ecosystem? Unpacking this relationship will be crucial for understanding the power relations within the Internet governance space.

3. Another question is about substantive vs. formal multistakeholder engagement practices. Observing current practices suggests that the core organization leading each initiative has an immense effect on the practices of organizing regional and national initiatives. So, in places where engagement of non-state actors in policy deliberation is by default limited, may experience limited substantive multistakeholder engagement, even when the organizers formally aspire to have a multistakeholder exchange.
4. An additional question is emerging around the tensions between semi-hierarchical approaches apparent in some of the regional IGFs and the independent nature of many of the national initiatives. Yes, there is a need and a call for cross fertilization between the national and the regional initiatives; and it should be expected that regional and national policy issues will be interrelated. At the same time, a regional discussion is not an aggregation of local discussion, just like the global IGF is not an aggregation of regional debates. While some issues are indeed interrelated, many of these initiatives view themselves as independent and as tackling a set of unique problems.
5. Building on the previous point, this report identifies additional potential tension. On the one hand, multistakeholderism implies a degree of independence of the actors and policy deliberation spaces. On the other hand, carrying out an IGF initiative in practice, even in the most modest constellation, requires an organizational core. One of the big questions is how to maintain balance that allows for relative independence of actors engaged in policy deliberation, while enabling sustainable funding and continuous organizational and political support.
6. Strong links between the regional and national IGF initiatives and the global IGF mean there is potential for greater cross-fertilization of policy agendas. In a way, this dynamic mirrors the Internet itself. Policy issues emerging from wide and rapid adoption of the Internet are no longer bound to particular geographies. Similarly, Internet-related policy issues can no longer be worked out in silos and the network of policy deliberation spaces that spawned off of the global IGF is reflective of that. There is potential cost and benefit attached to this dynamic for those seeking to engage in the Internet-related policy deliberation. On the one hand, it may be easier to move issues across geo-political boundaries. On the other hand, monitoring the local and regional IGFs becomes a necessity for those asking to stay on top of things.
7. The process of institutionalizing the presence of regional and national initiatives within the global IGF should be mindful of the capacity building function of the forum. Providing space for the facilitators of the regional and national initiatives to interact on day zero of the IGF, as well as during the forum, is instrumental for this group of idea entrepreneurs. Yet, more needs to be done to allow the mutual exchange between regional, local, and global discussions. The “Inter-regional dialogue” slots are potential venues where the larger IGF community can engage with the substance of regional and national IGFs; and some of the facilitators are involved in organizing workshops on specific themes. Moving forward, it would be important for the inter-regional exchange

- to focus on substantive topics, as opposed to discussion of the phenomenon itself or reports from the regional or national events.
8. This preliminary analysis calls attention to the funding models for regional and national IGF initiatives. There is very little data available on that, but identifying principles for sustainable funding of regional and national IGF initiatives is an essential element for assessment of sustainability of the entire enterprise as well as for deriving best practices for future local initiatives. What counts as a sustainable funding model may vary in different parts of the world, but bringing more transparency into the funding process of IGF initiatives is in alignment with the basic principles of the IGF.
 9. Conceptually, this report suggests potential directions for rethinking the meaning of impact of the IGF. The ripple effect of the global IGF practices and values has the potential to impact the practices of local policy deliberation as well as values that underpin those processes. We can see how by adopting the global IGF as a blueprint, the national and regional initiatives adhere to principles of inclusion and openness while make multistakeholderism a legitimate, and to a degree expected, principle for engaging in Internet-related policy deliberation. Practically, this signals a need for better communication and coordination models – there is more done on that front, but even more can be done.
 10. Finally, this preliminary report highlights the need to collect richer data about the events. This will not only allow assessing the scope of adoption of the multistakeholder approach to Internet governance and allow eventual systematic comparison across initiatives; it will also assist those trying to launch a multistakeholder discussion on Internet-related policy in their region in providing them with realistic expectations. Recently participants on the mailing list for regional/national IGF initiatives have conducted two surveys that would help establishing baseline information about those initiatives. The results are expected to be discussed in Bali and become part of the Outcome Report prepared by a group of coordinators of regional and national initiatives. The undertaking of the survey highlights lack of data on participation, organization processes, and funding mechanisms. Promoting better documentation of the regional and national efforts, should be a priority if we are to build on these efforts over time.

Acknowledgements

As an independent researcher, I want to thank Freedom House, and particularly the team behind the Internet Freedom initiative, for the grant that enabled preparing this document. I am deeply grateful to the coordinators of regional and national IGF initiatives, who took the time to talk to me about their work. I also want to thank Ms. Marilyn Cade for early brainstorming about the study of regional and national IGFs and her invaluable continuous assistance in navigating the IGF space.

Acronyms

EuroDIG – European Dialogue on Internet Governance

MAG – Multistakeholder Advisory Group

IGF – Internet Governance Forum

ISOC – Internet Society

ITRs – International Telecommunication Regulations

WCIT - World Conference on International Telecommunications

WSIS – World Summit on Information Society

Tables

Table 1: Regional IGF Initiatives*

2009	2010	2011	2012
		African IGF	African IGF
		Arab IGF	Arab IGF
Asia Pacific IGF	Asia Pacific IGF	Asia Pacific IGF	Asia Pacific IGF
Caribbean IGF	Caribbean IGF	Caribbean IGF	
Central Africa IGF	Central Africa IGF	Central Africa IGF	Central Africa IGF
Commonwealth IGF	Commonwealth IGF	Commonwealth IGF	Commonwealth IGF
East Africa IGF	East Africa IGF	East Africa IGF	East Africa IGF
European Dialogue on Internet Governance (EuroDig)			
Latin America and Caribbean IGF	Latin America and Caribbean IGF	Latin America and Caribbean IGF	
West Africa IGF	West Africa IGF	West Africa IGF	West Africa IGF
	Pacific IGF	Pacific IGF	Pacific IGF
		Southern Africa IGF	

*Based on formal records available at: <http://www.intgovforum.org>; the list does not reflect all events that may be considered as regional or national IGFs during respective years.

Table 2: National IGF Initiatives*

2009	2010	2011	2012
		Bangladesh IGF	Bangladesh IGF
		Brazil IGF	
	Canada IGF	Canada IGF	Canada IGF
	Côte d'Ivoire IGF	Cote d'Ivoire IGF	Cote d'Ivoire IGF
Denmark IGF	Denmark IGF	Denmark IGF	
Finland IGF	Finland IGF	Finland IGF	
			Gambia IGF
		Ghana IGF	
Germany IGF	Germany IGF	Germany IGF	Germany IGF
Italy IGF	Italy IGF	Italy IGF	Italy IGF
	Japan IGF	Japan IGF	Japan IGF
Kenya IGF	Kenya IGF	Kenya IGF	Kenya IGF
			Malta IGF
	Netherlands	Netherlands IGF	
	New Zealand IGF	New Zealand IGF	
			Nigeria IGF
Portugal IGF	Portugal IGF	Portugal IGF	Portugal IGF
Russia IGF	Russia IGF	Russia IGF	Russia IGF
Rwanda IGF	Rwanda IGF	Rwanda IGF	
Spain IGF	Spain IGF	Spain IGF	
Sweden IGF	Sweden IGF		
Tanzania IGF	Tanzania IGF	Tanzania IGF	
		Togo IGF	
Uganda IGF	Uganda IGF	Uganda IGF	Uganda IGF
	Ukrainian IGF	Ukrainian IGF	Ukraine IGF
United Kingdom IGF	United Kingdom IGF	United Kingdom IGF	United Kingdom IGF
IGF USA	IGF USA	IGF USA	IGF USA

* Based on formal records available at: <http://www.intgovforum.org>; the list does not reflect all events that may be considered as regional or national IGFs during respective years.

Table 3: 2012 Regional IGFs – Key Factors

Event	Planning process	Organizing actors	Speakers	Support	Main themes
African IGF (Cairo, Egypt ; Oct. 2-4)	N/A	The AfIGF bureau is composed of the 5 current conveners of the regional IGFs or their designates. It is chaired by the host country of the last AfIGF. For the period of 2012 - 2013, it is chaired by Ms. Nermine El Saadany of Egypt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • African member states • Regional IGFs • Academia • Private Sector • Civil Society • Regional and International Organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry of ICT of the Arab Republic of Egypt • Google • The dotAFRICA project of UNIFORUM ZACR • The Association for Progressive Communications • NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency • La Francophonie • The Free Software and Open Source Foundation for Africa - FOSSFA • The Smart Village Company LTD • Mobinil • Telecom Egypt • Vodafone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCIT-12 and Revision of the ITRs; • Approval of the Bureau of AfIGF2012 and Adoption of the AfIGF Terms of Reference. • Report from the Pre-conference Workshops (IPA, WCIT, OIF); • Access and Diversity; • Emerging issues; • Managing Critical Internet Resources; • Internet Governance for Development [IG4D]; • Security, Openness and Privacy; • Africa Digital Representation Strategy;

Event	Planning process	Organizing actors	Speakers	Support	Main themes
Arab IGF (Kuwait; Oct. 9-11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESCWA's experts group meeting; • Public Consultations • Recommendation by the Permanent Arabic Committee for Communication and Information • Endorsement of the Arab Telecommunication and Information Technology Council of Ministers • Formation of the Arab IGF MAG 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • League of Arab States • ESCWA • Kuwait Information Technology Society • NTRA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government • IGOs • Civil society • Private sector • Academia • Technical community 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access; • Openness; • Security and Privacy; • Content; • Managing Critical Internet Resources; • Youth;

Event	Planning process	Organizing actors	Speakers	Support	Main themes
Asia Pacific IGF (Tokyo, Japan; July 18-20)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program committee • Open call for workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DotAsia • Japan Internet Service Provider Association • D.C.N. Corporation (Ustream) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government • Civil society • Private sector • Academia • Technical community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aoyama Gakuin University • Asia Internet Coalition • APNIC • Fujitsu Limited • Google Inc. • Japan Internet Registry • Microsoft Japan • NEC • Biglobe • Nifty • NTT Communications • Softbank Telecom • So-net Entertainment • eAccess Ltd. • KDDI Corporation • Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State of the IGF • Internet for Disaster Relief and Restoration • Critical Internet Resources (gTLDs, IPv4/IPv6) • Cloud Computing • The future of Internet • Internet Governance for Development(IG4D) • Law Enforcement on the Internet; • Internet for Asia: Space for Free Expression & Information; • The Evolving Internet Ecosystem • Internet History • Cybercrime and protection of minors • Open Data • Cyber Security • Civil Society in Internet Governance/ Policy Making

Event	Planning process	Organizing actors	Speakers	Support	Main themes
Commonwealth IGF	N/A	COMNET Foundation for ICT Development is both Chair and provides Secretariat Services to promote and coordinate CIGF activities.	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commonwealth Secretariat • The UK government's Department for Media, Culture and Sport • ITU • The Malta Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth engagement; • Cybercrime;
East Africa IGF (Nairobi, Kenya; July 17-18)	N/A	Kenya ICT Action Network (KICTANet)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government • Civil society • Private sector • Technical community 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National IGF reports; • Intermediary liability; • ICANN; • Open data/Open government; • Cybercrime; • Youth and IGF; • Social media and democracy in East Africa; • WCIT and ITRs; • Stakeholder perspectives; • Public sector perspectives;

Event	Planning process	Organizing actors	Speakers	Support	Main themes
EuroDIG (Stockholm, Sweden; June 14- 15)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council of Europe • Federal Office of Communications, Switzerland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government • IGOs • Civil society • Private sector • Academia • Technical community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swedish Post and Telecom Authority • European Broadcasting Union • European Youth Forum • Swedish Internet Infrastructure Foundation (.se) • Other organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who sets the rules for the Internet? • An inclusive society – Europe in the digital age? • Intellectual property rights • Online privacy • Business innovation, future technologies and services • European democracy in change • Cyber-crime and cyber security • Child protection and child empowerment; • Digital citizenship • Internet governance principles, policies, and practices • Data retention, inclusion • Changes in media ecosystem • Territoriality, jurisdiction and internet related laws • Net neutrality

Event	Planning process	Organizing actors	Speakers	Support	Main themes
West Africa IGF (Sierra Leone; July 2-4)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sierra Leone Internet Governance Forum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government • Civil society • Private sector • Technical community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government of Sierra Leone, • Ministry of Information and Communications (SL), • The Free Software and Open Source Foundation for Africa (FOSSFA), • Internet Corporation of Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), • Internet Society, Africa Bureau (ISOC), • UNIFORUM ZACR • Sierra Leone Internet Governance Forum (SLIGF), • Internet Society Sierra Leone Chapter (ISOC SL), • National Telecommunications Commission Sierra Leone (NATCOM) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internet Governance in West Africa • Internet Governance for development; • Openness , Security and Privacy; • Access and diversity; • Managing the Critical Internet resources;

Table 4: 2012 National IGFs – Key Factors*

Event	Planning process	Organizing actors	Speakers	Support	Main themes
IGF Bangladesh (Dhaka, May 8)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bangladesh Telecommunication Regulatory Commission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • civil society • government • corporate sectors • technical sectors • media • academia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bangladesh NGOs Network for Radio and Communication(BN NRC) • Monthly Computer Jagat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internet governance • Internet use in Bangladesh (including cost, speed) • WSIS action plan • Broadband commission for digital development • Bangla domain space • Value added Services
Italian IGF (Torino, Oct. 18-20)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Top-IX Consortium, • CSP – Innovation in ICT • Nexa • Center for Internet and Society of the Politecnico di Torino (Department of Control and Computer Engineering) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • civil society • government • private sector • technical sector • academia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regione Piemonte • Turin District Council • Chamber of Commerce of Turin • Politecnico di Torino • Torino Wireless Foundation • the Institute of Informatics and Telematics of the CNR • ISOC Italy • Google • Vodafone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digital divides • Infrastructures for tomorrow's Web • Internet and entrepreneurship • Net neutrality • e-Government • Digital Diaries • Open Data

Event	Planning process	Organizing actors	Speakers	Support	Main themes
IGF Japan ¹² (Tokyo, July 18-20)	A series of preparatory meetings	N/A	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internet for Disaster Relief and Restoration; • The Impact of New gTLD; • Global Cloud Computing and its Challenges; • Internet Governance for Development; • The Evolving Internet Ecosystem; • Critical Internet Resources: IPv4/IPv6; • Protection of Children from Cybercrimes on the Internet; • Civil Society in Internet Governance/Policymaking;
Nigerian IGF (Abuja, Sep.25)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nigerian Communications Commission (NCC) • National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA) • Nigeria Internet Registration Association (NIRA) • Federal Ministry of Communication Technology. 	N/A	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access and Diversity • Security, Openness and Privacy • Managing Critical Internet Resources • Internet Governance for Development (IG4D) • Emerging Issues and Taking Stock and the Way Forward

¹² Was co-located with the Asia Pacific IGF.

Event	Planning process	Organizing actors	Speakers	Support	Main themes
Gambia IGF (Serrekunda, Feb 1-2)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Information, Communication and Infrastructure • Information Technology Association of The Gambia • Internet Society – The Gambia Chapter • University of The Gambia • PURA • The Gambia Chamber of Commerce • TANGO 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gambia CCTLD domain administrator (.gm) • UNDP in the Gambia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • managing critical internet resources; • security, openness and privacy and cloud computing; • internet governance and development; • access and diversity;
Uganda IGF (Kampala, Aug 7)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uganda National Information Technology Authority • Collaboration on International • ICT Policy in East and Southern Africa (CIPESA) • Internet Society Chapter Uganda. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government • Civil society • Academia • Private sector • The media • Individuals interested in Internet Governance 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online safety • e-Government • Infrastructure – IPv6; • Intermediary liability; • Net neutrality;

Event	Planning process	Organizing actors	Speakers	Support	Main themes
Ukrainian IGF (Sep 28)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ukrainian Internet association • Ukrainian League of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs • Association of • Information Technology Enterprises of Ukraine • Telecommunication chamber of Ukraine • Ukrainian Association of IT professionals • Independent Association of Broadcasters • INO “European Media Platform” • Council of Europe • Communication and Informatization Advisory Committee at the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine • State Agency for Science, Innovation and Informatization • more 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Adamant” company • “First National” • Ukr.net • “The Day” newspaper • “Era television company” • “First Business Channel” • Radio-ERA FM” • Publishing house “SoftPress” • Newspaper “DK-Zviazok” • “Telecom Communication and Networks” magazine • Agency of Communication and Informational Technologies “Press-Kit” • “Wireless Ukraine” magazine, Internet.UA • IT Expert, • InfoStream” • Delo” newspaper • Golos.UA • more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local legislation with regards to consumer electronics, access to communication, and state oversight • Regulatory reform • Multistakeholderism

Event	Planning process	Organizing actors	Speakers	Support	Main themes
UK IGF (London, Mar 22)	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nominet • UK Department for Culture, Media & Sport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government • Civil society • Private sector • Technical community 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identity governance on the internet • Content creation in a changing world • Cyber security

*Based primarily on reports submitted by regional and national initiatives at:

<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/component/content/article/114-preparatory-process/1281-igf-initiatives-2012>