

IISDREPORT

IISD's Contributions to the United Nations Internet Governance Forum: Workshop reports, 2008 to 2011

Compiled by Heather Creech, Director, Global Connectivity

October 2012



© 2012 The International Institute for Sustainable Development
Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development.

International Institute for Sustainable Development

The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) contributes to sustainable development by advancing policy recommendations on international trade and investment, economic policy, climate change and energy, and management of natural and social capital, as well as the enabling role of communication technologies in these areas. We report on international negotiations and disseminate knowledge gained through collaborative projects, resulting in more rigorous research, capacity building in developing countries, better networks spanning the North and the South, and better global connections among researchers, practitioners, citizens and policy-makers.

IISD's vision is better living for all—sustainably; its mission is to champion innovation, enabling societies to live sustainably. IISD is registered as a charitable organization in Canada and has 501(c)(3) status in the United States. IISD receives core operating support from the Government of Canada, provided through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), and from the Province of Manitoba. The Institute receives project funding from numerous governments inside and outside Canada, United Nations agencies, foundations and the private sector.

Head Office

161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3B 0Y4
Tel: +1 (204) 958-7700 | Fax: +1 (204) 958-7710 | Website: www.iisd.org

IISD's Contributions to the United Nations Internet Governance Forum:

Workshop reports, 2008 to 2011

October 2012

Compiled by Heather Creech, Director, Global Connectivity

Acknowledgement

IISD gratefully acknowledges the generous support of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
United Nations Internet Governance Forum, Hyderabad, 2008.....	2
Workshop #50: Can Internet governance change global futures? Or will global futures change Internet governance? Using scenarios to map the relationship between Internet governance and other global challenges.....	2
United Nations Internet Governance Forum, Sharm El Sheikh, 2009.....	4
Workshop #304: Measuring the impact of Internet governance on sustainable development.....	4
United Nations Internet Governance Forum, Vilnius, 2010.....	9
Workshop #49: Internet governance and the wider world: Building relationships between the Internet governance and other domains	9
United Nations Internet Governance Forum, Nairobi, 2011.....	12
Workshop #199: The future of the Internet and its impact on the world: A Scenarios Summit.....	12
Workshop #93: Multistakeholder Internet public policy dialogue: Lessons learned and best practices examples of local to global policy dialogue.....	17
Appendix: Summary of IISD’s Toolkit on Internet Public Policy Dialogue: Tools for the Practitioner	22

Introduction

From 2006 to 2011, the Global Connectivity program of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) has been active in the United Nations Internet Governance Forum (IGF). We have viewed the IGF as an important venue to bring together civil society actors, governments, the private sector and the technical community to debate the development and deployment of the Internet and to understand its growth and impact as a general purpose technology that underpins our economies and societies. It is IISD's position that the future of the Internet is critical to the future of sustainable development: the latter will be impacted positively or negatively based on Internet technical and policy decisions made in the next few years.

The following report presents the outcomes of a series of workshops organized by IISD at the IGF from 2008 to 2011 that focus on the intersection of Internet policy and governance domain, and sustainable development. These workshop reports also appear on the website for the IGF, at www.intgovforum.org.

United Nations Internet Governance Forum, Hyderabad, 2008

Workshop #50: Can Internet governance change global futures?
Or will global futures change Internet governance? Using scenarios to map the relationship between Internet governance and other global challenges

Report by Tony Vetter, IISD

Workshop organizer: International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

Co-organizers:

- Association for Progressive Communications (APC)
- The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI)
- Industry Canada

Moderator: Heather Creech, Director, Global Connectivity, IISD

Breakout group facilitators:

- Willie Currie, Policy Advisor, APC
- Don MacLean, Senior Associate, IISD
- Maja Andjelkovic, Advisor, IISD
- Tony Vetter, Global Connectivity Project Officer, IISD

Expert commentators:

- Willie Currie, Policy Advisor, APC
- Liesyl Franz, Vice-President, Information Programs and Policy, Commercial Sector, Information Technology Association of America
- Shalini Kala, ENRAP Program Coordinator, International Development Research Centre, New Delhi
- Jyrki Kasvi, Vice-Chair of the Committee for the Future of the Finnish Parliament

Summary:

The workshop drew approximately 50 to 60 attendees from the government, private sector, civil society and Internet technical communities. After welcoming the attendees, Heather Creech of IISD started off the event with the problem statement: Will global futures affect the development and deployment of the Internet; will development and deployment of the Internet affect global futures? The workshop participants were then provided with an overview of scenarios, how they are used and examples of major global scenarios processes (Shell, United Nations Environment Programme, and the Global Scenarios Group). The participants were randomly divided into four breakout groups. Each group was provided with a brief description of one of the four stories of what the Internet might look like in the future, as developed in a previous IISD workshop held in Ottawa, Canada.

Facilitators led the participants in each of the breakout groups to challenge the Ottawa workshop storylines by considering two questions:

- What impact do you think global crises could have on the management of the Internet?
- What will happen to your priority Internet concern in this future?

A volunteer from each of the groups reported back with a revised or enhanced story of what the Internet might look like. The four expert commentators were then asked to reflect on the four Internet futures by considering whether they had heard something from one of the stories that either changed their thinking or reinforced where they thought the Internet should go.

The causality of interactions between the critical Internet uncertainties and the global scenarios was unsolved in this first attempt. In most cases it is plausible that there will be co-evolution between the outcome of critical Internet uncertainties and the resolution of other global challenges; however, these integrated scenarios did provide fresh perspectives and insight on Internet futures. One of the most significant outcomes of the Hyderabad workshop was the recognition of the importance of addressing a range of Internet issues together rather than focusing on single challenges in isolation (IPv4/IPv6, net neutrality, security and so forth).

Further, the emergence of a strong global multistakeholder governance process endorsed by a global citizens' movement may greatly help to resolve the "process" aspects of Internet governance in a favourable way, as described in the Internet Commons scenario storyline. As well, one could see potential for the emergence of a policy handshake: actions in the realm of advancing sustainable development have important implications for the Internet, and decisions within the world of the Internet influence the prospects for sustainable development ("if you care about sustainable development, you should care about the future of the Internet, and vice versa").

This is a first attempt at making these linkages. It is hoped that the four storylines of the future of the Internet and sustainability will provoke further thinking on necessary and possible decisions about critical Internet uncertainties that will advance the most desired global scenario.

United Nations Internet Governance Forum, Sharm El Sheikh, 2009

Workshop #304: Measuring the impact of Internet governance on sustainable development

Report by Tony Vetter, IISD

Workshop organizer: International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

Co-organizers:

- Centre for Environment and Development in the Arab Region and Europe (CEDARE)
- Association for Progressive Communications (APC)
- International Telecommunications Union (ITU)

Workshop description:

Mechanisms are needed to monitor the impact of Internet policy and governance choices. How do we determine whether these choices are helping to achieve the broader sustainability goals of humanity? What do Internet policy-makers need to measure to find out whether they are “getting it right”? This workshop provided an opportunity for participants to explore the range of indicators needed to monitor whether Internet policy and governance choices are leading to an Internet that is supporting social, environmental and economic goals, as well as innovations in accountability and governance. The workshop was organized to be interactive, using a breakout group format to engage participants directly, rather than relying on a traditional panel format.

At the beginning of the workshop, the following panellists gave presentations to prime breakout group discussions:

- Heather Creech, Director, Global Connectivity, IISD
- Dr. Hossam Allam, Head, ICT4D, CEDARE
- Susan Teltscher, Head, Market Information and Statistics Division, International Telecommunications Union, Telecommunications Development (ITU-D)

After the breakout groups reported back, the following panellists offered their observations and learnings from the discussions:

- Susan Teltscher, ITU-D
- Dr. Hossam Allam, CEDARE
- Alan Finlay, Consultant to APC

The following references were provided as background information on the actors involved in the field, initiatives that people can connect with, and contacts for further information:

- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO): Developing and Using Indicators of ICT Use in Education (<http://www.unescobkk.org/index.php?id=1803>)
- IISD: Internet Governance and Sustainable Development: Towards a Common Agenda (<http://www.iisd.org/publications/pub.aspx?id=911>)
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD): ICTs, the Environment and Climate Change (<http://www.oecd.org/sti/ict/green-ict>)
- ITU-D: The e-Environment Readiness Index (EERI) (<http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/cyb/app/EERI.html>)
- ITU-D: Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development (<http://www.itu.int/ITU-D/ict/partnership/>)
- International Data Center (IDC): IDC's Green Initiative: ICT Sustainability Index (<http://www.idc.com/getdoc.jsp?containerId=227897>)
- World Health Organization (WHO): Global Survey for eHealth (<http://www.who.int/goe/data/en/>)

The three breakout groups included:

- Environmental indicators
- Economic indicators
- Social indicators

Report from Environmental indicators breakout group:

This breakout group had something of a clean slate in that not a lot of work has been done yet on Internet and supporting technology environmental indicators. Here are some of the ideas for such environmental indicators that were discussed:

- Tracking ICT re-use versus recycling versus disposal rates
- Percentage of material used in ICT manufacture that is recyclable at end-of-life
- Average lifespan of ICT products prior to recycling or disposal
- Carbon footprint reduction resulting from e-service use
- Public awareness of ICT re-use or recycling options
- Availability of environmental content on the Internet
- Corporate greening of ICT infrastructure
- Incentives for greening ICT infrastructure

Report from Economic indicators breakout group:

There is a need to develop indicators that explicitly address the impact of ICT on GDP. Researchers could potentially look at the following:

- Volumes of ICT exports and imports
- Employment rates in ICT-related industries
- Income generation in ICT-related industries
- Need more research into implicit measures of ICT on GDP, for example:
 - Measuring the impact of ICTs on efficiency
 - In-depth analysis of ICT impact on productivity in other sectors (services, etc.)

Report from Social indicators breakout group:

It was necessary to attempt to classify the issues before identifying gaps for further work. The initial classification was organized as follows:

- Gender
 - Access to the Internet on gender
 - Internet literacy
 - Access by gender
 - Gender-specific content
- Education
 - Quantity or quality of access
 - Universities that have access
- Health
 - Telemedicine facilities
- Solidarity
 - Amount and speed
 - Disaster management and relief
- E-government
 - Quantity
 - Access
 - Timeliness

Conclusions and further comments:

An initial general observation made by Heather Creech was that the indicators advanced by each of the breakout groups appeared to parallel the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in many ways. It was agreed that this was worth exploring further.

In terms of Internet and supporting technology environmental indicators, Susan Teltscher commented that not a lot of work has been done there yet and that this is an area where it would be important to focus more discussion. She expressed interest in taking initial learnings from this session to such discussions. She also noted that monitoring the availability of environmental content on the Internet as a measure of the success of awareness-raising efforts had promising implications for furthering environmental objectives.

Regarding Internet and supporting technology economic indicators, Susan noted that in the case of the indicators forwarded by that breakout group, we already have well-developed definitions for those that would make it easier to move to the data collection phase. Once the data are available, country-level academics and policy researchers would do the analysis. Susan acknowledged that identifying workable Internet and supporting technology social indicators is a significant challenge. She commented, however, that some notable progress had been made on this front by UNESCO in their work developing and using indicators of ICT use in education (<http://www.unescobkk.org/index.php?id=1803>). This work identified 10 core indicators and about 30 more through their work with developing countries to look at the impact of ICT use on education. Susan also pointed out that the World Health Organization is conducting its second global eHealth survey to gather evidence on trends and uptake of the use of ICT for health (<http://www.who.int/goe/data/en/>). In general terms, Susan commented that speed and quality of access are very important technical indicators when monitoring the impact of Internet and supporting technology social indicators. On the topic of the MDGs, Susan recalled that at their very early stages of development there was work done to link ICTs to the MDGs, but that effort was eventually dropped. Reflecting on the discussions at this workshop, she commented that it might be worthwhile picking that up again.

Hossam Allam commented we do not currently have a good development index that includes Internet and supporting technology indicators. As an example, Hossam suggested that we should be looking to incorporate Internet and supporting technology indicators into indexes such as the Human Development Index (HDI).

Alan Finlay cautioned that the point of entry issue for this workshop is huge and it is important not to set the bar too high. Alan pointed out that surveys are key instruments for collecting relevant indicator data. A case in point: monitoring progress on environmental objectives has more to do with changes in behaviour, not the take-up of ICTs. Where do you develop these indicators, in the ICT sector or the environmental sector? It is important to focus on measuring human impact.

After the workshop, the co-organizers met to explore how these observations might inform further work in this area. There was some discussion regarding the increasing acknowledgement of the impact that ICTs have on the environment, including their contribution to the problem of climate change, as well as being a tool for addressing environmental issues. It was noted that an analysis by The Climate Group in partnership with the Global e-Sustainability Initiative (GeSI), with independent analysis by McKinsey & Company, suggests that smart solutions enabled by ICT could save 7.8 Gt CO₂e in 2020, or 15 per cent of global emissions. However, the co-organizers all felt that, as of yet, there has been little action to develop a coherent and structured approach for advancing the development of ICT statistics that

could be used to monitor the impact of ICT on the environment and climate change, as well as the effectiveness of ICT applications upheld for their environmental management and impact mitigation potential. It was agreed that the availability of and agreement upon such statistics will become increasingly important to developing countries as they rapidly develop their ICT infrastructures and user communities. Effective indicators to monitor the impact and benefits of their management of this growth will be critical as they join the rest of the international community in tackling the problems of climate change, reducing the impact of ICT production and consumption on the environment as well as developing intelligence strategies for managing their environment using ICTs.

IISD took the action to explore further with the co-organizers the potential for North and South partners working on the use of ICTs for environment and climate change to join forces with those working on the development of ICT indicators in a coalition. Such a coalition could explore working together on a scoping study on this topic, which could be used to engage with the Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development on a broader program of work, opening the way for a more integrated suite of indicators measuring ICT for sustainable development.

United Nations Internet Governance Forum, Vilnius, 2010

Workshop #49: Internet governance and the wider world: Building relationships between the Internet governance and other domains

Report by Ben Akoh, IISD

Workshop organizer: International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

Co-organizers:

- Big Room
- Industry Canada
- World Wildlife Federation
- Accountability

Moderator: Heather Creech, Director, Global Connectivity, IISD

Panellists:

- David Souter, Managing Director, ict Development Associates Ltd; Visiting Professor in Communications Management, Business School, University of Strathclyde; and Associate of IISD
- Ellen Blackler, Executive Director, Regulatory Planning & Policy, AT&T
- Georg Neumann, Senior Communications Coordinator, Transparency International
- Arvind Ganesan, Executive Director, Business and Human Rights Program, Human Rights Watch
- Fatimata Seye Sylla, National Coordinator, USAID Project/Education de Base (USAID/EDB), Senegal
- Kaidi Tingas, Project Manager/Public Participation Expert, Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC)

Workshop description:

Representatives of global civil society and business organizations spoke to the importance of Internet infrastructure and management for their work on environment, rights, development, governance and entrepreneurship, along with the challenges they face in trying to engage in and be informed of the international debate on Internet policy and governance. How can the knowledge and expertise of the major international NGOs and their constituencies enrich and strengthen the IGF? How will the IGF become more relevant to them? A regional perspective on these challenges will be presented by a participant from a developing country context.

A brief substantive summary and the main events that were raised:

Participation: There is a need for more dialogue between the Internet professional community (participant at the IGF) and the Internet interested community and the wider world—i.e., other organizations and stakeholders not usually

present at the IGF and who are experiencing the impact of the Internet at a social, economic, cultural and political level. Participation at the IGF is mostly attended by the technical community. Few organizations like IISD are absent. It is unusual for this kind of international policy domain.

Representation: The IGF recognizes the under-representation of developing country governments. But governments that are present usually reflect concerns with the supply of the Internet rather than concerns with the use of the Internet. For instance, no health or education ministries are present. This same issue is carried through to the IGF from the World Summit on the Information Society. Similarly, there is quite good representation from the private sector that supplies the Internet, but there is very little representation of the private sector that makes use of the Internet in daily work. Also, the financial services industry, which is very dependent today on the Internet, is not present in the debate. Organizations and individuals who are concerned with the Internet are present but there are little or no development agencies, environment agencies, trade unions and so on, of the kind one would expect to find in other international fora.

Expanding the defining of development to sustainable development: Sustainability is about the nexus of relationships among economic, social and environmental issues. This nexus could enable us to advance the thinking that surrounds the present conception of development, from one that is based on growth alone, to one that is based on growth that can be sustained and that can have lasting impact. The Internet likewise needs to look at a relationship with the rest of the world that uses fewer of the earth's resources, leaves more behind, and contributes more to economic, social and environmental sustainability.

The sustainability of the Internet itself: The Internet itself needs to be concerned with its own sustainability. The Internet's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions is growing faster than that of any other economic sector as a result of increased access to the Internet and an increased use of ICT devices. That growth of emissions as a result of increased access and use of the Internet is a challenge to government, industry, Internet professionals and users. The Internet can be made more sustainable if, for example, environmental impact assessment is included as part of standard setting, as part of network design and deployment, in the way in which people use the devices that they have. Equally, the Internet can be used in ways that reduce greenhouse gas emissions—by dematerialization, through more efficient management of transport and power generation networks, and so forth. There are very substantial gains that can be made but this will happen only if governance and regulatory structures for the power sector, for the transport sector, for the communication sector incentivize the use of the Internet in ways that achieve that reduction. Finally, there are long-term changes in society that result from the way in which the Internet has become central to much that happens: for example, globalization of economic production and globalization of culture; changes in the production and consumption patterns for certain goods and services; new ways of working for people and the companies for which they work; social networking and the way that has changed individual communications, notably in changing relationships with families; and access to content (might be news or rumour; might be entertainment, political comment, or pornography), all of which change the way society relates to these. The fundamental issue is that society is changing in ways that require us to reinterpret our understanding of development, and of sustainable—of sustainable development. It is not just a matter of the Internet community understanding a sustainability concept here and incorporating it, but also that the sustainable development community needs to rethink the way in which sustainability interacts with society, economy and culture as a result of the impact that the Internet is having.

Conclusions and further comments:

On Internet policy and other domains: The Internet community needs to discuss the impact of the Internet on other issues—development, the environment, health, education and others—in spaces belonging to those other issues. The Internet community needs to listen and learn from those policy domains and then review what is happening with the Internet in light of their priorities—recognizing that the Internet is not a solution for the challenges in those domains, but changes and may make a contribution to addressing them.

An invitation to other policy stakeholders to come into the Internet policy fora: This expanded participation would encourage an IGF going forward that is a proactive convener of a number of these other stakeholders. Key stakeholders absent from the dialogue include:

- Governments—and not just government departments that manage the ICT sector, but also those that make use of ICT
- Developing country governments are also under-represented
- Private sector participations—and not just private sector and businesses that supply ICTs, but also those that use them to run their businesses or provide goods and services. Highly dependent sectors such as financial services presently have very little input into the Internet policy fora
- Civil society participation—including the mainstream civil society organizations such as development, environment agencies, rights groups, women’s organizations, trade unions, faith groups, etc. These play a large part in other policy debates but do so less in the Internet policy fora

Thoughts on the relevance of the next five years: The growing importance of the Internet to our society, economy, culture and environment calls for an urgent need for the IGF to address the challenges of multistakeholder participation. The relevance of the next five years of IGF activity will be determined by its success in this regard.

United Nations Internet Governance Forum, Nairobi, 2011

Workshop #199: The future of the Internet and its impact on the world: A Scenarios Summit

Report by Ben Akoh, IISD

Workshop organizer: International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

Co-organizers:

- Internet Society
- ICT Strategies, on behalf of the Internet Governance Forum USA (IGF-USA)

Moderator: Markus Kummer, Vice-President of Public Policy, Internet Society

Panellists:

- Laszlo Pinter, Center of European University in Budapest, advisor to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
- Heather Creech, Director, Global Connectivity, IISD
- Walda Roseman, Chief Operating Officer, Internet Society
- Ben Akoh, IISD
- Marilyn Cade, Analyst, IGF-USA
- David Satola, World Bank
- Taylor Reynolds, OECD
- Steve DelBianco, NetChoice

Workshop description:

In an effort to understand the future of the Internet and its role as a catalyst for change, many organizations have used scenarios planning tools to try to assess possible directions and to prepare for them. Scenarios planning is a methodology used widely in business and increasingly in the public and non-profit sectors to allow organizations to anticipate how the future may turn out. It is particularly useful in an environment of great uncertainty and has been used to guide decision making by major groups like the World Economic Forum and multinational corporations like Shell and Cisco.

Scenarios planning is neither guesswork nor statistical analysis. It is a structured process to help organizations break free from ties to “the official future” to consider other possibilities that they may confront. The stories resulting from this process are intended to reveal plausible courses of events, not probable ones. Scenarios try to take into account real events, data and trends that may have various outcomes. While scenarios are imaginative, they are intended to make people and organizations aware of possibilities that could have an impact.

Scenarios have been used extensively to explore the world's economic survival, climate change impacts and other critical uncertainties. The future for the Internet is a classic example of where scenarios have been and could be used to great effect: its development so far has been rapid and often unpredictable. So have its impacts, as online access to the Internet and World Wide Web is rapidly altering societies, economies and politics. One of the world's most rapidly expanding technological mechanisms, the Internet—along with the vast realm of content and applications it connects—is still very young and emergent in how it is impacting the world's citizens, businesses and governments. How can those working on Internet governance best make use of scenarios planning for the future of the Internet and its impact on the world?

The purpose of the IGF session was twofold:

- To present to IGF participants a wide range of scenarios on the future of the world and the future of the Internet: Are Internet scenarios taking into consideration major changes in social, political and economic systems? Are global scenarios considering how changes in Internet technologies, content and services will affect economic, social and political development?
- To bring together people from all walks of life who have applied scenarios planning methodologies to try to understand the future of the world and the future of the Internet to talk about their experiences: What questions did they try to address? What approaches did they use? What were the outcomes? Were the outcomes useful? What could be improved? How can scenarios planning be used to improve our approach to Internet governance and public policy issues related to the Internet?

The session was structured as follows:

1. Introduction of scenarios processes/scenarios stories: Ten-minute overview
2. Presentations of several major global and local scenarios exercises

Key outcomes of the Scenarios Summit:

This brief report is structured, according to the purpose of the workshop, to address:

- Scenarios presentations: a wide range of scenarios on the future of the world and the Internet, to the IGF, using exemplars that were discussed during the summit.
- Capacity building: to highlight some preliminary understanding of scenarios use by the various stakeholders.
- Outcomes and lessons learned: to highlight the key outcomes and lessons learned of scenarios use, the approaches that individuals with scenarios experience have applied and how the outcomes and the lessons from these can improve Internet governance and Internet public policy.
- Next steps: to define potential next steps following the Scenarios Summit.

A. Exemplars of scenarios on the future of the world and the Internet

1. The South African Mont Fleur scenarios: describe South Africa and the options available to it post-apartheid
2. UNEP global environmental outlook scenarios
3. IISD Internet and sustainable development scenarios: connecting Internet issues with sustainable development, climate change, energy consumption, financial crisis, security (in Canada as a part of the Canadian Internet future, and in Hyderabad with IGF youth delegates and other stakeholders)

4. The US White House AT&T competition scenarios: to inform policy on the consequences of allowing market competition to AT&T
5. US High-Definition TV scenarios: concerning the path toward the cost, impact and direction in relation to the introduction of HDTV
6. ISOC Future of the Internet scenarios: to generate thinking about strategic planning processes and the Internet Society's (ISOC) three-year program development
7. Togo (IISD) Internet public policy scenario: to facilitate local engagement and to elicit future Internet policy concerns
8. Daniel Erasmus's scenarios: for the Internet in 2020, presented at the World Congress of IT
9. The IGF-USA scenarios: to deepen and broaden awareness about Internet governance and build support for the IGF and for the Internet
10. U.K. IGF scenarios: conducted against the existing structures of future vision and the Foresight 2020 program

B. Preliminary understanding of scenarios

1. The future is uncertain and it is important. Scenarios are about navigating the fog of uncertainties, risks and opportunities for the future. They are not a prediction of what the future will be but they help to explore the possible, not just the probable.
2. Scenarios narratives must be coherent stories, grounded in some sense of reality. They involve a combination of qualitative and quantitative data—the narratives and the facts. The quantitative underpins the qualitative and helps to test the validity of the assumptions made.
3. The objectives and purpose of embarking on scenarios need to be clear and the parameters—such as spatial characteristics and timescales—must be clearly defined and established. They should focus on goals and targets rather than a broad brushstroke picture of different futures. They should be clear about the options, risks and opportunities surrounding the goals and targets.
4. Getting the question right is an essential and critical element of designing the scenarios process.
5. Scenarios can be divisive or easy to manipulate, and can potentially go off track.
6. As it relates to data for scenarios:
 - a. Scenarios should be preceded by some research and data gathering. As it relates to national and regional IGFs, they should be preceded with the development of background papers that inform the process.
 - b. Data used for generating scenarios must be evidence-based and must be generated involving a broad sector of society that those scenarios will impact.
 - c. Funding may be required to thoroughly conduct a scenarios exercise; however, the input of volunteers should not be discredited. The availability of funding does not legitimate the process, but available, quality data and a mechanism for peer review do make it credible.
7. Scenarios help policy-makers to think outside the box in a “safe way” and help the broader community, especially those who are not a part of the traditional Internet governance domain, to validate and contribute to outcomes that could have impacts on themselves and governments.

8. Scenarios provide a common lexicon for talking about open Internet, offering a strategic framework to think about and make observations on present and future events and benchmark the strategic efforts of organizations working on Internet policy that makes them nimble in their approach within uncertain environments. Scenarios are also useful tools to collaboratively engage a broad multistakeholder audience made up of diverse perspectives.

C. Key outcomes and lessons from scenarios used for the future of the world and the Internet

1. There is difficulty arriving at a conceptual framework surrounding the Internet and sustainable development. More effort is required to develop a framework that can be applicable in this context.
2. A number of important intersections are evident between the Internet and sustainable development, such as the importance of (a) universal access as an essential part of an Internet Commons scenario (a desired future scenario that involves everyone, their input, agreement, resources and tools needed to achieve this future), and (b) IPv6, which is necessary to wire up the natural environment, to facilitate the Internet of things, and to address online trust and identity issues.
3. Excessive government control is the main risk to the future development of the Internet.
4. Stakeholders involved in the scenarios exercise should be helped to understand the importance of the process as a planning methodology and to see its relevance to their own local context, including the recognition of any existing policies, processes and frameworks that relate to the present and future state of the Internet.
5. Stakeholders should recognize two important observations that should be considered during future scenarios activities: (a) the shift in the IGF from single-topic discussions focusing on purely technical issues, to areas such as global foreign policy, Internet rights and freedoms, and cross-cutting thematic dialogues that take on a multistakeholder approach, and (b) the tension between state and non-state actors and the roles that these stakeholders have to play in the Internet's development.
6. Good data are important for proper scenarios planning. The World Bank's Open Data Initiative sets the tone for the release of data by other important organizations such as the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN); however, mechanisms to ensure the integrity of the data should be built into data-gathering methodology and process. Likewise, users should have their capacities built and the right amount of awareness raised on the importance of gathering and manipulating data.
7. The decisions, in terms of the Internet, that are being made today are going to have ramifications for the next 50 to 100 years, because infrastructures developed 50 to 60 years ago are still in use today. Scenarios should take this into cognizance.
8. Organizations or policy-makers that are targeted for influence from scenarios outcomes need to have their capacity or ability to know what to do with the information that is generated.

D. Next steps, action points and key messages

- **Open data are important to scenarios, and data should be made available for use.** To address data needs for future scenarios, the IGF can leverage the support offered by the OECD to use its data complementarily with the data already made available by the World Banks: "OECD's data focus on newer variables, have newer data sets, and offer more trends focused on the market and technology."

- **At least one scenarios workshop should be held at the next IGF.** A pilot scenarios project, preferably half a day, is recommended at the next IGF, which may be useful for comparing notes and lessons learned in the past year since the summit and to improve on knowledge of the methodology through a “learning by doing approach.” At least one of the IGF workshops should be implemented using a scenarios methodology. Scenarios exercises should be encouraged at the national level.
- **Resources are required to conduct an IGF scenarios exercise, and strategies are needed to explore the availability of resources.** Stakeholders should explore options for resources to support having a scenarios exercise at the next IGF. In this regard, organizers of the Scenarios Summit should meet, debrief and explore resources required for a workshop on at least one global scenarios process.
- **Internet economy/green economy, ICTs and sustainability, ICTs and knowledge creation, and content are desirable pilot workshop topics at the next IGF.** A number of possible scenarios topics that could be explored are:
 - A specific agenda item on the upcoming Rio+20 Summit, namely, the green economy. There is need for a scenarios workshop with a green agenda, one that shifts global economic structures to be more supportive of green activities and one that links existing Internet economy work in support of a transition toward a green economy.
 - The linkage between ICTs and sustainability, following the increasing numbers of workshops in the Nairobi IGF that focus on ICTs in disaster management.
 - The importance of local, user and community generated content relevant to people in their own language, maintaining their heritage and protecting their identity.
 - The role that ICTs play in linking to multiple and coordinated transitions in between processes, such as from creating knowledge to its generation and eventual distribution. This involves locally coordinated transitions necessitated by culture, specific local problems and local ecosystem conditions.
- **Skills development of users, policy-makers and government is required for scenarios methodology to be useful.** The stakeholders should explore the possibilities of skills development on scenarios methodology and how to do so effectively using some of the generic capacity-building and training modules that have already been developed, distributed to instruct trainers in a consistent way across different regions. Capacity building should also focus on various levels of governments in order to have them engage more structurally in policy-focused conversations about the future.
- **Sufficient scenarios work has been done that can be evaluated to inform future practice.** The scenarios discussed in sub-section A (above) should be reviewed in the coming years to determine their value to Internet public policy. This review may involve a wide monitoring of sources that could potentially inform the need to adapt existing programs and plans.
- **Scenarios should be explored as a useful tool at the IGF.** Stakeholders should explore how they could make scenarios planning a more useful tool for the IGF in the future—particularly, how it could adopt some of the tools and processes that were discussed during the summit, use more third-party data and information, and poll and utilize stakeholders’ networks and partner bases around the world.

Workshop #93: Multistakeholder Internet public policy dialogue: Lessons learned and best practices examples of local to global policy dialogue

Report by Ben Akoh, IISD

Workshop organizer: International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

Moderator: David Souter, Managing Director, ict Development Associates Ltd; Visiting Professor in Communications Management, Business School, University of Strathclyde; and Associate of IISD

Panellists:

- Byron Holland, Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA)/Canadian Internet Forum
- Alice Munyua, East African IGF
- Nahmsath Yabouri, Togo National IGF
- Raul Zambrano, United Nations Development Programme
- The Rt. Hon. Alun Michael MP, Nominet UK
- Raul Echeberria, LACNIC, Brazilian/South American IGF
- Ben Akoh, IISD

Workshop description:

In the past five years, Internet public policy dialogue has taken various forms, shapes and approaches, and has been implemented at various levels and in various regions of the world. National fora have been seen as a positive outcome of the global process resulting in an increased number of dialogue spaces, especially in developing countries. The quality of discussion, however, is called to question as it is reflected in the outcomes of public policy dialogue at levels other than global. The workshop sets out to discuss some of these issues and especially some of the valuable lessons learned from global to local Internet public policy dialogue processes, based on research conducted at all levels of the IGF (global, continental, regional and national), tools and methodology used for effective public policy dialogue, and how these can influence the way in which future Internet policy dialogue is designed and implemented.

A brief substantive summary and the main events that were raised:

- Two ways of examining the relationship between global and local policy approaches are: (a) the expansion of the global IGF in its current structure to national and regional areas, and the linkages such as feeder events through which they make issues visible at the global event, and (b) the complex nature of the interface between Internet governance and other public policy domains; the continuum of Internet issues in areas where the Internet has made transformative changes, like intellectual property, security, education, health, and with technical and standards bodies and other stakeholders.
- The different gradation of interventions in Internet governance: laws and regulations on one side, and social norms on the other.

Panellists' highlights:

Raul Zambrano

- How will concerns to address issues at a global level result in a policy at the national level? For instance, how do we address global climate change with policies at the national level?
- Most developing countries are good at passing laws and not very good on implementation.
- People are part and parcel of the policy-making process; therefore, conventions that involve them should involve their decision. It is about participatory governance.
- Participatory governance has five levels: awareness raising, consultation, representation, partnerships and audits. We are mostly involved with the first two and less so on the last three.
- For some countries, there are a number of issues here: how to balance and prioritize global and local issues; capacity challenges; and, resource issues.
- There may be need to mainstream Internet governance into broader governance issues from an early stage.
- There is a linkage between Internet governance and human rights. Internet and rights should not be anchored to political rights only but also to social and economic rights. Rights and the Internet are a cross-cutting issue.
- How do we tackle critical development issues such as food and health and how this connects to Internet governance?

Byron Holland

- The global multistakeholder forum is somewhat prescriptive in terms of its themes; however, the Canadian context generated themes that were bottom-up by asking, "What do Canadians want to talk about?" What are the themes of relevance when it comes to the Internet and Internet governance that can be talked about in a multistakeholder environment?
- It took a year planning the process. Initially put out a survey in 2009 that was statistically relevant to over 1,700 people cross-cutting geographic sections, stakeholder groups; and an online discussion list open to the Canadian Internet Registration Authority.
- Developed discussion papers with key partners; IISD and MNET, tease out themes.
- The national forum generated passionate debate even from people who are not regularly exposed to multistakeholder models of dialogue. Small regional consultations were useful and allowed the drilling down into groups usually excluded from such dialogue.
- An unintended consequence and benefit is the creation of a dialogue space and the results of networks between people and stakeholders whose paths would otherwise not cross each other.
- A more generic event rather than a specific technology or self-hosted event on the back of some other national event would be more efficient.

Alice Munyua

- Issues discussed at the regional East African IGF (EAIGF) emerge from addressing the critical Internet governance concerns at the national level. These are further discussed and validated at the next face-to-face meeting. National and one-day face-to-face meetings are building blocks to the regional forum.
- Each country develops three critical issues that are relevant for discussion at the regional level. Usually similar across countries. Some of the issues have included investments in fibre optic cable, affordable access to broadband, local content, gender and ICTs, and critical Internet resources.
- Effort has been made to attract a broad range of stakeholders: governments, industry and technical community, some of whom financially support the national and regional forum.
- The regional IGF acknowledged from the beginning that the global IGF had limitations, that it could not make decisions. The EAIGF had to be different and reduced the influence of the global IGF.
- The 2011 process is calling for the institutionalization of the forum, which may result in a government-led initiative that is backed by the East African Community (COMESA). This has potential impact to the broad multistakeholder and button-up approach that has been assumed hitherto.
- Convinced that research is important, the EAIGF has decided to run a particular issue through research and have the outcomes shared at the regional forum, and the policy recommendations will be applied to government policies.
- Involved children as an additional stakeholder, run and organized by children themselves. They raised issues such as access, skill development, cyber security and online protection.
- Governments are important stakeholders. They are, however, new to the stakeholder model. Better ways of engaging them would have to be considered.

Raul Echeberria

- A stakeholder assembly was created in 2008 in the LACNIC region, through which reports are presented to the different stakeholders. This forum evolved and became one for preparing for the IGF. It is currently in its fourth year and an important regional event with participation reaching over 100 persons.
- This led to an online consultation that lasted a month.
- Funding was made available this year after four years, to provide fellowship to participants from the regional IGF to attend the global session. Three persons that have never attended a global IGF are funded to attend. This establishes connection between the regional and the global.
- The regional meetings gather more support and participation than the global ones, indicative of the fewer numbers of participants to the global event compared to those who attend the regional meeting. The regional meetings are more important than the global ones.
- This sort of multistakeholder dialogue has influenced how public policy meetings are held in Latin America. Rather than the closed sessions, dialogue is becoming more open and requiring the participation of more stakeholders. For instance, an eLAC process, which started out as a purely government-only process, has evolved to involve more multistakeholder participation.

Alun Michael

- Countries can learn from each other's experience at hosting national and regional fora.
- Cooperative governance is less understood in the administration of the world. It is much harder work in terms of participation and better in terms of outcome. And it involves several layers of government—engaging people at village/town right through to the international level.
- Politics is driven by events. They also require evidence to show business and private sector that cooperative governance is actually a better way to do things. It is not about disempowering government but about getting a balance in the way things are done.
- Decisions need to be based on evidence and principles.
- The IGF needs greater and better engagement of parliamentarians. One way of doing this is to have a parliamentary session for legislators framed within the broader context of the IGF. Another way is through integrating the inputs from groups such as the commonwealths, where inputs are made from developed and developing countries. Other engagement strategies include the setup of website for parliamentarians, such as www.pictfor.com, to publicize their activities; a chief executive forum involving senior industry chief executives and parliamentarians that meet every six weeks with those who can make serious decisions about the industry; the implementation of a "broad local level" approach to addressing otherwise perceived "big, international and pervasive" Internet issues. One example includes the creation of the business crime centres (examples exist in Wales and Yorkshire in the United Kingdom) to deal with cybercrime issues.
- The United Kingdom engages young people not just by inviting them to the debate but by engaging them more proactively such as participating in the IGF, debating issues among themselves, and addressing the parliament.
- The IGF is a process, not an event. The regional and national will become more important than the global. Thus, the global should enable us to go further and not to come to conclusions but to find ways of reaching conclusions in the right place, such as in the individual countries or regions where a link can be established between both.

Conclusions and further comments:

- Implementation of multistakeholder framework at the national level depends on the use of a very simple framework that is focused on the principles of multistakeholder participation; that process must be supported through funding contributions by all stakeholders at the national level. At the EAIGF, funding support is mostly generated from the government and industry and less so from society. The quality of the multistakeholder model in each country is largely dependent on the level and strength of these various multistakeholder groups.
- Recommendations can be made at the local/national level. At the EAIGF, it has taken the form of a report to governance and other stakeholder groups. In recent times, the introduction of evidence-based research has contributed to the development of these reports that inform policy. The issues identified at the national levels in Kenya, for instance, are taken back to the global level.

- The Internet affects, benefits, and is important for every aspect of life and for every constituent—online or offline. Every decision taken—social, economic or human; government or legislative—should be understood in the context of the 21st-century ways of communicating and of human interaction. We could either leave the decisions about the Internet (a) from the technical community, (b) through briefings and research papers, or (c) through partnership with various stakeholders. The third option is the only one worth considering.
- Evidence is important in the shaping of national policy. Research is one way of generating evidence.
- Consent is also important, of those for whom the decisions are made at these levels and who would be affected.
- A number of tools have been applied and implemented over the years in generating public debate and participatory policy making. IISD has put them together for policy-makers and actors as consent- and evidence-based tools in a new toolkit that supports multistakeholder Internet public policy dialogue (see Appendix).

Appendix: Summary of IISD's Toolkit on Internet Public Policy Dialogue: Tools for the Practitioner

1. Evidence-based tools:

- Mapping the broad policy landscape: A contextual mapping of policy making, including documenting: the policies that are already in place, the issues that may warrant attention for policy formulation or reform, the stakeholders that are or should be involved, and the mechanisms currently available for policy dialogue.
- Mapping the ICT landscape: Understanding the status of ICT deployment through empirical (evidence-based) data and analysis in a way that it reveals the role of ICTs in the community as a whole, including adoption rates and usage, in the context of the state of the economy, geography, demographics and trends.
- Online surveys: Creating a baseline of stakeholder opinions, perceptions and knowledge levels. Web-based surveys represent a cheap (even free) and easy way of reaching a cross-section of interests.
- Expert roundtables: Bringing together experts and thought leaders to discuss trends, frame issues and identify information gaps, critical uncertainties and policy challenges.

2. Consent-based tools:

- Background papers and policy briefs: Presenting the evidence: Based on the mapping, data gathering and survey processes, writing the background paper that describes issues. Must be written by a local and highly respected expert and "ambassador" who understands the issues and is able to articulate the concerns that must be addressed to the larger community.
- Public multistakeholder event: The holding of a public event that brings in a diversity of sectors and interests for the purpose of developing a shared understanding of issues and challenges.
- Focus groups and workshops: A useful way to explore perceptions, attitudes and trends within a community or group of people that have something in common and organized around a geographic space (city or regional), theme or profession.
- Scenarios, backcasting and related modelling and forecasting processes: Scenarios can be a useful activity that helps stakeholders consider possible futures, identifying in the process common concerns and differences of opinion, and building awareness of options. Backcasting is a useful process to consider what actions might be necessary over time to achieve a desired future. Both will benefit from modelling data and trends as inputs.
- Online discussion boards and mailing lists: Discussion boards and mailing lists represent a common way for groups to keep in touch, keep organized and engage in debate across a far-flung network of people—a very practical administration tool useful for asynchronous consultations, agenda-setting prior to in-person consultations, and for eliciting evidence and consent.

These tools have been applied at one stage or another in the Canadian, West African and East African IGFs. The full Toolkit is now published and available at <http://www.iisd.org/publications/pub.aspx?pno=1619>

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development.

International Institute for Sustainable Development

Head Office

161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3B 0Y4

Tel: +1 (204) 958-7700 | Fax: +1 (204) 958-7710 | Website: www.iisd.org