1. Preamble

The ninth annual Internet Governance Forum (IGF) will be held in Istanbul, Turkey on 2–5 September 2014. This year’s overall theme is “Connecting Continents for Enhanced Multistakeholder Internet Governance”.

Major developments in global internet governance have taken place since the 2013 IGF in Bali. From the first-ever UN General Assembly (UNGA) resolution on the right to privacy in the digital age¹ to the announcement of the U.S. government’s intention to give up its oversight over key internet domain name functions², to the historical NETmundial meeting in Brazil.

In spite of a busy year, some of the most difficult issues have not been resolved. The question of enhanced cooperation was not addressed in any definitive way by the Commission on Science and Technology for Development. A major UN report³ tackled mass surveillance and privacy but governments have yet to react. The U.S. government will relinquish its responsibilities over the DNS (Domain Name System), but many questions remain on what new mechanisms will be established. The NETmundial meeting in Brazil demonstrated that a multistakeholder process can produce an outcome (the NETmundial Statement and Roadmap) and advance key shared principles, including that the internet is a global resource and a critical enabler of human rights and development, which should be managed in the public interest. But how should these principles be operationalised? In some ways, these developments leave more questions than answers.

We expect that IGF 2014 will be a place for valuable dialogue to reflect on these developments. We also expect this IGF to be more outcome oriented than any previous IGF. Multistakeholder participation needs to evolve and so should the IGF and there is much to learn from NETmundial. Although we don’t think the IGF should be a space for negotiating text, we do encourage the IGF to adopt some of NETmundial’s innovative approaches. In line with the recommendations of the Working Group on IGF Improvements⁴ we support a more outcome oriented IGF and we are actively working to produce outputs from IGF 2014 to feed into other processes. In order to have the resources and capacity to do so, and to continue its growth and development as the home of the global multistakeholder community, the UN General Assembly should renew the IGF for another 10 years not 5, and UNDESA (UN Division for Economic and Social Affairs) should ensure it has the required leadership and institutional capacity to fulfill its mandate under the Tunis Agenda⁵.

Below are APC priorities for IGF 2014, clustered according to the event’s sub-themes, followed by a schedule of APC activities in Istanbul.

2. APC’s priorities at IGF 2014

2.1 Sub-themes: Internet and Human Rights and Enhancing Digital Trust

The number of human rights related sessions at the IGF continues to grow. This year approximately 47 out of 87 workshops focus directly or indirectly on the IGF 2014 sub-
themes of human rights and digital trust, with privacy, surveillance, freedom of expression, freedom of association, and economic, cultural and social rights emerging as key concerns.

This indicates the maturing of the IGF and mirrors growing international support for the norm that human rights enjoyed offline need to be promoted and protected online. The NETmundial outcome document, for example, included human rights as its first principle:

> Human rights are universal as reflected in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and that should underpin Internet governance principles. Rights that people have offline must also be protected online, in accordance with international human rights legal obligations.

Since the 2013 IGF, no less than 10 resolutions and decisions were adopted by the UN General Assembly (UNGA) and the UN Human Rights Council (HRC) that reference internet and human rights. Even UNGA committees that do not typically deal with human rights, recognized the applicability of the international human rights framework in their annual resolutions on internet related issues. In comparison to the HRC 2012 landmark resolution, the HRC’s second resolution on human rights on the internet, supported by 82 governments, addressed a broader range of internet rights, including the right to education, privacy, freedom of expression, and the right of peaceful assembly and association. APC welcomed this resolution, especially for making a strong link between the internet and development, referring to the internet as an “enabler for development” and as a “vibrant force which generates economic, social, and cultural development”. The internet should be mobilized for social, human and economic development; all stakeholders should reaffirm their commitment to make this happen.

**Escalating threats against Human Rights Defenders and LGBTIQ people using the internet in their work**

Threats against human rights defenders who rely on the internet to advance their work and advocacy continue. This includes the arbitrary arrests and imprisonment of two APC allies in Egypt, Alaa Abd El Fattah and Yara Sallam. Yara Sallam is an Egyptian women’s human rights defender who was arrested in Egypt on 21 June 2014 during a peaceful demonstration against the country’s anti-protest law. Alaa Abd El Fattah, Egyptian activist and developer is currently serving an unjust, politically motivated prison sentence for the third time.

Civil society actors working on sexual rights face aggressive and systematic digital harassment. In APC’s 2013 EROTICS global survey, 98% of sexual rights activists responded that the internet is an important public sphere for the advancement of sexual rights. However 51% said they faced online hate speech, censorship or violations of their privacy. Sexual rights activists from Africa and the Middle East face the further risk of being attacked by their governments because of their online activities. APC’s has also found the internet has become a space where targeted misogyny and sexualised violence is increasingly threatening to narrow the space for the public participation of women and other groups facing discrimination, including people who identify as LGBTIQ.

**APC’s human rights related activities at IGF 2014**

Human rights and internet governance will again be a focus for APC at the IGF as we join with APC staff, members and partners from around the world to share their perspectives on current internet rights issues.

Specific human rights-related activities that APC is organising or co-organising include:

- The launch of the African Declaration on Internet Rights and Freedoms, which addresses issues related to the internet and economic, social and cultural rights.
- A pre-event that will bring together sexual rights activists, women's human rights defenders and gender equality advocates to discuss the intersections of sexuality rights and internet rights, and strategies for integrating gender issues in IGF 2014’s themes. The event will include a presentation of an evolving set of Feminist Principles of the Internet, as well as a session for IGF participants on how to engage multiple stakeholders to integrate women's rights, sexual rights and internet governance.
The launch of a Global Information Society Watch (GISWatch) special report on internet rights and freedoms in Turkey.

The launch of the GISWatch 2014 annual report. At IGF 2013, in the wake of the revelations of mass government surveillance, the main session on emerging issues was dedicated to internet surveillance. APC decided to dedicate our 2014 edition of GISWatch to surveillance and human rights because we feel that this issue was not sufficiently addressed at IGF 2013 or in any relevant forum since last year. Users have lost trust in the internet as a safe platform for day-to-day personal communications. Using the 13 International Principles on the Application of Human Rights to Communications Surveillance\(^\text{13}\) as a basis, this GISWatch considers the state of surveillance in 53 countries plus eight thematic reports framing key issues stake. The report shows how both states and companies are complicit in communications surveillance.

The Internet Ungovernance Forum (IUF), a parallel event being organised by a group of Turkish civil society organisations.\(^\text{14}\) APC firmly believes that the IGF is a forum for dialogue around internet rights, including incidences of censorship and blocking. We trust that issues of censorship and blocking in Turkey will be discussed at the IGF and welcome and support the IUF as it provides an alternative space that will give these concerns the focus they deserve.

A roundtable on enhancing digital trust and the internet and human rights.\(^\text{15}\) The roundtable will seek to reach agreement on a message the IGF could send to the Human Rights Council (HRC) on its upcoming panel discussion of the Right to Privacy in the Digital Age, which will take place on September 12 in Geneva immediately following the IGF. This is an excellent opportunity for the IGF to produce tangible outputs that can input into other processes.

### 2.2 Sub-themes: Policies enabling Access, Growth and Development on the Internet and Internet as an Engine for Growth and Development

Continued efforts are needed to ensure universal, public and affordable access to the internet.\(^\text{16}\) Access for all can help create more egalitarian societies, strengthen educational and health services, local business, public participation in political processes, access to information and good governance.

Support for provision of public access has unfortunately fallen off the agenda in most countries as a result of the rapid growth of internet-connected mobile phones. However, there is now a growing recognition that there will continue to be a need for public access for the foreseeable future. Large-format screens and high definition multimedia provide a more immersive learning, professional or entertainment experience, but may be too slow or costly via a mobile connection. Research conducted over the last five years in low- and medium-income countries has found that at least one-third of internet users had only public access to the internet, and most users (55%) would use computers less if public access were not available. Public access venues are also often the first point of contact with computers and the internet.\(^\text{17}\)

Economic disempowerment as well as cultural and social norms act as significant barriers to access for women and girls. Policy measures on advancing universal access to ICTs should include strategies to address gender discrimination and inequalities, with clear goals and systems to monitor progress towards achieving gender equality.

The key access-related policy areas APC focuses on are public access facilities, effective access for women and girls, access to radio spectrum, infrastructure sharing and integrated national broadband planning. With the June 2015 deadline for the analogue to digital broadcasting switchover coming up next year, spectrum issues in particular are likely to be an area of increasing attention, including the use of TV White Spaces to bring broadband access to remote areas.

At NETmundial we proposed the following principles to ensure access for all: Access to infrastructure irrespective of where you live; Inclusive design; Equal access for men and women; Affordability; Public access; Cultural and linguistic diversity.\(^\text{18}\) We view the IGF as a valuable space for diverse stakeholders to take on these principles, which need to be translated into reality.
An APC speaker will participate in the focus session on ‘access’ at the Istanbul IGF.

2.3 Sub-theme: IGF and the Future of the Internet Ecosystem

The IGF’s current mandate is due to expire and is up for renewal by the UN General Assembly in late 2014. Over the course of its first eight years, the IGF has matured and demonstrated its relevance under challenging conditions. Perpetually underfunded and under-resourced, the IGF has done remarkably well. The 2013 IGF in Bali provided a robust forum for discussion of the most pressing issue of the day - digital surveillance - and provided the ideal platform for discussing the proposed NETmundial meeting. The IGF has evolved to include regional, national and global processes linked to the UN, but is also independent. It is far from perfect, but its value should not be underestimated.

That said, the IGF needs to be strengthened. It needs to be more outcome oriented, which is largely up to its participants to achieve. Another concrete way to strengthen the IGF is to establish an IGF-linked information clearing house and policy observatory. An important factor for strengthening the IGF will be its renewal. APC strongly supports renewing the IGF for 10 years, not 5, in order to allow it to work on a longer cycle and be more effective in implementing its mandate and constantly improving while doing so.

Even with a strengthened IGF, APC believes there are shortcomings in the current internet governance ecosystem. Critical internet policy issues are not adequately addressed, such as freedom of association, net neutrality, mass surveillance, the protection of privacy, and cyber-disarmament to name just a few. Some of these require containing the actions of corporations, and some require containing the arbitrary acts of governments. Some of these issues may require action beyond the IGF. But this does not mean that a new body on internet policy is needed. Instead, new mechanisms to address specific issues should be considered if the need arises. As we recommended in our submission to NETmundial:

“IG stakeholders and bodies should identify public policy issues without a clear home, and whether they are best dealt with through a single institution or forum, or through a distributed model. In some instances there might be a need for a new mechanism to be established to address specific issues which have emerged, such as, for example, to address and prevent the rights violations that result from mass surveillance by governments, working with corporations. We would still recommend first exploring whether, for example, existing human rights mechanisms cannot play the needed role before opting for the creation of new mechanisms.”

The recently launched NETmundial Initiative has set out to identify and address gaps in the current IGF ecosystem. APC fears it might, unintentionally, do more harm than good. The limitations of an existing forum (in this case the IGF) does not in itself justify the establishment of a new forum. We hope that the NETmundial Initiative will go about its tasks with sensitivity, giving consideration to the views and experiences of all stakeholder groups, and recognising that conflict of interest is a reality in internet governance: a reality that needs to be addressed if the public interest is to be protected and promoted. APC’s remarks on the NETmundial Initiative are available on the our website.

The Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation initiated a mapping exercise to identify where internet policy areas are being addressed and where there are gaps. Establishing new mechanisms to address gaps can make the internet ecosystem more sustainable. But any internet policy process aimed at protecting and promoting the broadest possible public interest, be it at the national, regional, or global level must include civil society. These multistakeholder processes need to be democratic, inclusive, transparent and accountable.

Looking ahead at other developments in the IG ecosystem

There will be a number of opportunities for the unresolved issue of enhanced cooperation to play out in the coming year, and we expect IGF 2014 to be an important staging ground for discussion. Unfortunately, the most significant spaces are not inclusive, transparent and accountable to all stakeholders. Starting in late October, the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) will hold its plenipotentiary meeting in Busan, South Korea.
Plenipot is the ITU’s highest policy-making event, during which member states take a number of actions, including updating the ITU Constitution and Convention, adopting resolutions on policy, electing ITU senior leadership, and setting out the strategic plan of the ITU. As it is an intergovernmental meeting, we can expect to see a push from some governments to play a larger role in internet policy. We hope that they will take this opportunity to discuss the outcomes of NETmundial and how they can support operationalising the NETmundial principles.

Plenipot also offers some opportunities for the ITU to more fully embrace multistakeholder working methods. For example, governments could decide to make all of the ITU’s documentation available without paywall protection and grant non-governmental actors more scope to influence ITU activity, by opening bodies like its working group on internet-related public policies (CWG-Internet) beyond governments. Governments could even decide to do away with its “pay to play” system of membership that allows certain entities to have different degrees of access and influence depending on how much money they are willing to pay in membership dues.

The overall review of the World Summit on Information Society (WSIS+10) is taking place in the next year. An intergovernmental preparatory process will be initiated next June and will culminate in a high level event in December 2015. Unfortunately, while we’ve seen an uptake and deepening of multistakeholder processes in internet governance in the past 10 years since WSIS, the overall WSIS+10 will mark a departure from this trend. The preparatory process and outcome will be intergovernmental with a final document negotiated only between governments. Non-governmental stakeholders will have only an informal role, and will be consulted at various points in the preparatory process. While there will be speaking rights for all stakeholders at the meeting itself, there seems to be minimal opportunities for influencing the preparatory process, which is when the outcome document will be developed.

Governments undoubtedly have responsibilities in internet policy making, chief among them the promotion and protection of human rights online and formulating and implementing policies that promote universal, public and affordable access to the internet. But given that WSIS was the genesis for many multistakeholder internet governance processes, including the IGF, it is anachronistic and hugely disappointing for the overall WSIS+10 review to take such a closed approach.

The relatively closed nature of these two major upcoming internet governance events further reaffirms the importance of the IGF. While not a substitute for meaningful participation for all stakeholders at Plenipot and the overall WSIS+10 review, the IGF provides an important forum for all stakeholders to share views, information, and strategies around these important events. Leveraging the IGF as a platform for input into these processes is especially critical as some stakeholders will use them to pursue the intergovernmental approach as the primary one to internet governance, which can undermine the IGF and the evolution of multistakeholder approaches that have stemmed from it.

2.4 Critical Internet Resources

In March 2014, the U.S. Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) made an historic announcement of its “intent to transition key internet domain name functions to the global multistakeholder community.” This development has triggered a process to identify a new system to replace NTIA’s “historic steward” of the DNS (internet domain name system), which has been cause for concern and debate among governments and other stakeholders for more than a decade.

APC’s believes the following considerations should guide the process:

- Stability and security of the internet should be the highest priority at all times.
- Completing the plan to bring The Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) functions under Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) as originally documented in the White Paper is an advisable and overdue milestone, but not the ultimate goal.
- Oversight of IANA should be a multistakeholder function.
• No single stakeholder group should have sole oversight of IANA.
• No single country should have a preeminent role in overseeing IANA.
• As IANA’s functions are limited to data maintenance, database provision and coordination — whose methods are determined in the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), ICANN and the Regional Internet Authorities — IANA should not have a policy role. Each of these organisations must retain the oversight of its own data and methods.
• Oversight of IANA will focus on performance, adherence to Service Level Agreements and Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with the organizations with which it has signed MOUs. These MOUs should be modeled on the current MOU between ICANN and the IETF, as described in Request for Comments (RFC)2860, RFC6220 and in subsequent updates to the MOU, with similar reporting requirements and appropriate service level agreements.
• Reporting requirements and service level agreements between IANA and its partners should be negotiated and executed in a public and transparent way; ensuring that all affected stakeholders are involved in the development of those requirements.21

2.5 Emerging Issues: Network Neutrality

Network Neutrality has been identified as a core emerging issue for the 2014 IGF and a focus session will be dedicated to it. Net neutrality has become increasingly important as growing numbers of internet providers are now influencing the content flowing over their networks. Internet providers are making deals with content providers (or through mergers internet and content companies) to prioritise the delivery of their content or to subsidise the cost of content delivery in high cost networks. The latter is of particular concern to APC as it is now common in developing countries where mobile networks provide free access to services such as Facebook and Wikipedia. This consolidates their hold on the market, lowering the competitive pressure on access charges, and also makes it much more difficult for smaller independent content providers to gain visibility for their services. Over the last months, in the US, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has announced new Open Internet rules; at the European Union net-neutrality is planned to be enshrined into legislation but the outcome of this process is difficult to predict; whilst the Brazilian National Congress adopted the Marco Civil which contains strong network neutrality provisions.

3. Gender and Internet Governance

Discussions at IGF 2013 raised awareness about existing barriers and inequalities within all stakeholder groups that impact on full and meaningful participation of women in internet governance. According to APC’s 2012 IGF Gender Report Card22, only 4% of workshops included gender as an important or main theme, while gender was briefly mentioned in 19% of the reported workshops. Significantly, women were most likely to constitute the majority of participants for workshops on the theme of internet governance for development, whereas emerging issues like security, openness and privacy had far fewer women participants, with some workshops without any female representation at all. The 2013 IGF Report Card indicates that men constituted a majority of participants in more than half of all workshops reported, while only 30% of workshops had a roughly equal number of men and women participating.

Efforts and discussions to advance internet governance process principles as well as to strengthen the IGF must include recognition and measures to address these barriers to achieve a truly open, inclusive, participatory processes. APC will continue to work with the IGF Secretariat to implement the IGF Gender Report Card as part of the formal reporting process for the IGF. Capacity building measures and resources can also act to significantly advance the participation of women and other underrepresented groups.

4. Strengthening impact of regional and national IGFs

APC has been participating in IGFs at all levels based on our view that stronger and more sustained national level multistakeholder participation will in turn inform regional and
global processes and help address the current gaps in participation and influence between stakeholder groups, and between people from developing and developed countries. Over the years we have seen ups and downs in the regional and national IGFs and we have been pleased to see the maturing of some national and regional IGFs in many respects. We will strive to use IGF 2014 to more effectively integrate regional and national perspectives into the global dialogue. In 2014, APC helped organise and/or participated in the following regional and national IGFs:

*Africa IGF:* held in Abuja in July 2014.
*Latin American and Caribbean IGF:* held in July 2014 in San Salvador.
*Arab IGF:* to take place on 26-27 November 2014 in Beirut.
*National IGFs:* Gauteng IGF in South Africa; IGF-USA and Net Hui (New Zealand).

5. Dynamic Coalitions

**Internet Rights and Principles**
APC participates in the Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights and Principles. This year the Coalition will reflect on “The Charter of Human Rights and Principles for the Internet: Five Years On”.

**Gender**
APC is the focal point for coordinating the Dynamic Coalition on Gender. This year, the coalition will analyse the comparative findings from the 2012 and 2013 Gender Report Cards to provide specific recommendations on improving gender inclusion into the IGF. APC will also present and launch the Feminist Principles of the Internet — an evolving document that was collaboratively developed as a result of a global meeting discussing issues of gender, sexuality and the internet in April 2014. The coalition will discuss gaps and how to apply the principles in guiding or advancing discussions on key internet governance issues, and strategies on how to bring this forward.

**Public Access**
APC has been collaborating with the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) on public access issues and will be participating in the IFLA organised Dynamic Coalition on Public Access in Libraries. The session will concentrate on the intersection of development and public access to ICTs, building on feedback from workshops held at CSTD, the African Internet Governance Forum and the WSIS+10 High Level Event in June, as well as experiences gained at the meetings of the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals in New York during 2014.

**Net Neutrality**
While APC is not directly involved in the DC on Net Neutrality, the network neutrality debate is gaining political momentum and we are taking an increasing interest in the issue, especially in regard to the implications for developing countries and marginalised users. Several countries have already implemented network neutrality laws, while many others are currently elaborating or scrutinising the opportunity to elaborate network neutrality legislation. Nevertheless a variety of divergent (and somewhat incompatible) approaches are emerging around network neutrality legislation. These issues will be presented by some of the contributors to the 2014 Report of the meeting of the Dynamic Coalition on Network Neutrality. The meeting will be introduced by a keynote delivered by Vint Cerf, followed by an interactive debate.
6. APC’s presence at IGF 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 02</td>
<td>**Best Bits</td>
<td>Co-organised by APC**&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://bestbits.net/events/best-bits-2014/">http://bestbits.net/events/best-bits-2014/</a>  &lt;br&gt;**Beyond NETmundial: The Roadmap for Institutional Improvements o the Global Internet Governance Ecosystem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 08</td>
<td><strong>Collaborative Learning Exchange on Multistakeholder Participation</strong></td>
<td>Co-organised by APC and ISOC and others  &lt;br&gt;<a href="http://sched.co/1k5HP3I">http://sched.co/1k5HP3I</a>  &lt;br&gt;<strong>Sex, Rights, and Internet Governance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 03</td>
<td><strong>Gender Dynamic Coalition (including launch of the Feminist Principles)</strong></td>
<td>Organised by APC  &lt;br&gt;<a href="http://sched.co/1oxTPgX">http://sched.co/1oxTPgX</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 9</td>
<td><strong>Setting the Scene: Setting the Scene:Topical Insight and Debate Related to the Subthemes of IGF 2014</strong></td>
<td>Organised by APC Executive Director Anriette Esterhuysen as a member of the MAG  &lt;br&gt;<a href="http://sched.co/1j2YmKz">http://sched.co/1j2YmKz</a>  &lt;br&gt;<strong>Evaluating MS Mechanisms to Address Governance Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 04</td>
<td><strong>Promoting platform responsibility for content management</strong></td>
<td>Organised by APC  &lt;br&gt;<a href="http://sched.co/1mj11Y7">http://sched.co/1mj11Y7</a>  &lt;br&gt;<strong>Launch of the annual Global Information Society Watch</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 07</td>
<td><strong>Launch of an African Declaration on Internet Rights &amp; Freedoms</strong></td>
<td>Co-organised by APC  &lt;br&gt;<a href="http://sched.co/1k5Acu0">http://sched.co/1k5Acu0</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 08</td>
<td><strong>Round table for organisers of workshops on enhancing digital trust and the internet and human rights</strong></td>
<td>Organised by APC Executive Director Anriette Esterhuysen as a member of the MAG  &lt;br&gt;<a href="http://sched.co/1oy67pF">http://sched.co/1oy67pF</a>  &lt;br&gt;<strong>Annual APC Party</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Follow APC online at IGF 2014

News and blog posts: https://www.apc.org
In-depth analysis: https://www.apc.org/en/pubs
Gender and ICT policy: GenderIT – genderit.org
GISWatch site: www.giswatch.org
Press inquiries: contact elvira@apc.org in English, French or Spanish.
Twitter: @APC_News; @APCNoticias; @APCNouvelles; @GenderITorg; @genderites;
APC staff: https://twitter.com/APC_News/lists/apc-staff;
APC members: https://twitter.com/APC_News/lists/apc-members
https://www.facebook.com/APCNouvelles
Flickr: https://www.flickr.com/groups/apcimages

8. APC members and staff at IGF 2014

APC staff: Alex Groome, Anriette Esterhuysen, Chat Garcia, Chi Liquicia, Dafne Plou, Deborah Brown, Elvira Truglia, Emilar Vushe, Jac SM Kee, Jan Moolman, Joy Liddicoat, Karen Banks, Katerina Fialova, Mallory Knodel, Mike Jensen, Nadine Moawad, Roxana Bassi, Mohammad Tarakiyee, and Valeria Betancourt.

APC members: Pavel Antonov (Bluelink, Bulgaria), Ariel Barbosa, Olga Paz, and Julian Casasbuenas (Colnodo, Colombia); Manavy Chim (Open Institute, Cambodia), Osama Manzar, Ritu Srivastava, and Syed Kazi (Digital Empowerment Foundation, India), Valentina Pelizzer and Aida Mahmutovic (OPWSEE, Bosnia and Herzegovina), Liz Probert (Green Net, UK), Lillian Nalwoga (CIPESA, Uganda), John Dada and Theresa Tafida (Fantsuam Foundation, Nigeria), Faheem Malik, Furhan Hussain, Gul Bukhari, Shahzad Ahmed, and Sadaf Baig (Bytes for All Pakistan), Hamada Tadahisa and Shibata Kuniomi (JCANET, Japan), Byoungil-Oh (Jinbonet, South Korea), Nica Durnalo and Lisa Garcia (Foundation for Media Alternatives, Philippines), Maksud Haque (BFES, Bangladesh), Arturo Bregaglio (Radio Viva, Paraguay), Claudio Ruiz, Francisco Vera, and Paz Pena (Derechos Digitales, Chile), Dhyta Caturani (Engage Media, Australia), Vivian Zuñiga (Sula Batsu, Costa Rica).

APC affiliates: Avri Doria, AHM Bazlur Raman, Towela Nyirenda-Jere, Rafik Dammak, Jeanette Hofmann.
3 http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/RegularSessions/Session27/Pages/ListReports.aspx
4 http://www.unctad.info/en/CstdWG/
5 http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/aboutigf
10 Results from APC’s survey on sexuality and the internet: http://erotics.apc.org/research/survey-sexual-activism-morality-and-internet
11 Preliminary research findings on social media and technology-related violence against women: https://www.takebackthetech.net/files/PreliminaryResearchFindings_English.zip
12 Note: Registration is required for this event.
13 https://necessaryandproportionate.org/
15 http://igf2014.sched.org/event/4b177e66626305f6b0dc4a34689bb48e?iframe=no#.U_5ULbywIyG
16 Aside from extending coverage to more remote areas, and providing public access facilities, the cost of access still needs to be reduced dramatically. The Alliance for Affordable Internet’s (A4AI) Affordability Index of 2013 shows that the UN Broadband Commission target of entry-level broadband services priced at less than 5 percent of average monthly income is far from attainable at present for most developing countries. In 46 developing countries in the A4AI study, the cost of entry-level broadband exceeded on average 40 percent of monthly income for people living on $2/day, and in many countries exceeded 80 percent or even 100 percent of monthly income. There are a range of technological solutions to this challenge but their use is often restricted by policies and regulations which result in artificially high prices and poor coverage. See: The Affordability Report 2013 http://1e8q3q16vyc81g8l3h3md6q5f5e.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Affordability-Report-2013_Final-2.pdf
17 http://tascha.uw.edu/publications/connecting-people-for-development
21 Developed by Avri Doria and available at http://content.netmundial.br/contribution/one-possible-roadmap-for-iana-evolution/153
23 http://www.uneca.org/afigf
25 http://Internetrightsandprinciples.org/site/