



**APC Priorities for the Sixth Internet Governance Forum  
Nairobi, Kenya September 27-30 2011**

**Table of Contents**

APC priorities at the 2011 IGF.....2

1. Internet governance for development (IG4D).....3

    1.1 Increasing the participation of stakeholders from developing countries in internet governance agenda setting and decision-making .....3

    1.2 Greater focus on the impact of internet policy on sustainable development .....3

2. Emerging issues.....4

    2.1 Equitable access to the internet from a human rights perspective .....4

    2.2 Conflict minerals and why they are important in internet governance.....4

    2.3 Affordability, openness and network neutrality in the mobile internet.....4

    2.4 Network neutrality.....5

3. Managing critical internet resources.....5

    3.1 Reform of internet governance institutions to ensure greater accountability, participation and transparency.....5

    3.2 The ICANN reform process .....6

4. Security, openness and privacy .....6

    4.1 Internet intermediary liability.....6

    4.2 Impact of internet restrictions in freedom of expression and association online.....7

    4.3 Responding to online violence against women.....7

5. Access and diversity.....8

    5.1 Open spectrum and television white spaces: Creative regulation of the frequency as a means of bridging the access gap.....8

    5.2 Access to knowledge.....9

6. Cross-cutting issues.....10

    6.1 Human rights approach to internet governance: The relationship between human rights and the internet regulatory environments.....10

    6.2 Capacity building, particularly of stakeholders from developing countries.....10

7. Other issues.....10

    7.1 The evolution, strengthening and impact of the national and regional IGFs.....10

    7.2 IGF improvements and the CSTD working group.....10

APC's presence at the IGF .....12

## PREAMBLE

The sixth annual meeting of the IGF will take place in Nairobi, Kenya from 27-30 September 2011 with **Internet as a catalyst for change: access, development, freedoms and innovation** as its main theme. APC strongly supports the focus on access, development and freedoms. All are critical if the internet is to fulfill its potential to contribute to social justice and development. Internet access remains unavailable or unaffordable for many people, poverty and famine –currently plaguing Kenya's next-door neighbour Somalia- persist in spite global and national commitments to meeting development goals. The free flow of information on the internet is increasingly challenged by walled gardens, by an over-emphasis on the protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights by those with vested interests in their enforcement and by policy-makers who forget their primary responsibility is to uphold and protect fundamental human rights.

APC believes that the IGF remains a creative and influential forum for policy dialogue on issues identified as priorities by APC members for the 2009-12 period<sup>1</sup>.

At the close of the 2010 IGF, the future of the IGF was uncertain. APC welcomes its continuation and looks forward to the Nairobi meeting. This will be the first global IGF held in sub-Saharan Africa. We thank the hosts, the government of Kenya, and trust that attendance will be excellent. Stakeholders from the African continent have made impressive collaborative efforts to prepare for the IGF with regional forums taking place in East Africa, West Africa and for the first time this year, Southern Africa. These and many linked national forums, have raised awareness and deepened the understanding of the internet governance in an important part of the developing world. Strengthening such processes in Africa and in other regions adds critical value to the IGF process.

We also express our thanks to the IGF Secretariat's team for its hard and remarkable work to organise the 2011 event in this period of changes. Finally, we want to acknowledge the commitment of the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG).

## APC priorities at the 2011 IGF

Clustered according to the IGF main themes, our priorities are:

### Internet governance for development (IG4D)

- Increasing the participation stakeholders from developing countries in internet governance agenda setting and decision-making
- Greater focus on the impact of internet policy on sustainable development

### Emerging issues

- Equitable access to the internet from a human rights perspective
- Conflict minerals and why they are important in internet governance
- Affordability, openness and network neutrality in the mobile internet
- Net neutrality

### Managing critical internet resources

- Reform of internet governance institutions to ensure greater accountability, participation and transparency
- The ICANN reform process

<sup>1</sup> APC strategic priorities for 2009-12 are: affordable internet access for all; creative engagement with strategic technologies; making ICTs work for a sustainable environment; strengthening the "information commons"; securing and defending internet rights; and improving governance, including the governance of the internet.

## Security, openness and privacy

- Internet intermediary liability
- Impact of internet restrictions in freedom of expression and association online
- Responding to online violence against women

## Access and diversity

- Open spectrum and television white spaces: Creative regulation of wireless internet as a means of bridging the access gap
- Access to knowledge

## Cross-cutting issues

- Human rights approach to internet governance: The relationship between human rights and internet regulatory environments
- Capacity building

Additionally APC will focus on:

- The evolution, strengthening and impact of the national and regional IGFs
- IGF improvements and the CSTD working group which has had its mandate extended by ECOSOC

# 1. Internet governance for development (IG4D)

## ***1.1 Increasing the participation of stakeholders from developing countries in internet governance agenda setting and decision-making***

Increased participation of stakeholders from developing countries is crucial. Dialogue at the IGF needs to reflect the needs and views of developing country actors.

Deepening democracy in internet governance is related to shifting the foundations of decision-making processes. It implies the institutionalisation of a development perspective and a rights-based approach within internet governance decision-making processes and institutions. APC finds it particularly important that the IGF explores the internet public policy implications for the achievement of global development objectives and the realisation of rights in the internet sphere.

## ***1.2 Greater focus on the impact of internet policy on sustainable development***

APC supports an approach to development that comprises economic, cultural and social development as well as the protection of the environment, not solely economic growth. In internet governance this means putting social justice and development considerations at the centre of all public policy-making.

The WSIS documents<sup>2</sup> make frequent reference to “sustainable development” but discussions at the IGF have not taken this forward.

We believe that the internet community needs to have more respect for the wider social justice and development agenda beyond “ICT for development”. The voices and experiences of development policy-makers, development practitioners and social justice activists and not just ICT practitioners and policy-makers need to be heard at the IGF.

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.itu.int/wsis/documents/doc\\_multi.asp?lang=en&id=2266|2267](http://www.itu.int/wsis/documents/doc_multi.asp?lang=en&id=2266|2267)

## 2. Emerging issues

### **2.1 Equitable access to the internet from a human rights perspective**

From network neutrality to critical internet resource policies on law enforcement, from ICT4D to mobile connectivity, from surveillance, data protection, and privacy to protecting internet access for all, from freedom of expression and association to protecting human rights defenders and promoting social movements. Issues affecting human rights advocates continue to emerge, often resulting in violations including interference with freedoms of expression and association, unlawful arrest and detention, harassment and extra-legal surveillance.

At the same time human rights and internet regulatory environments vary widely, particularly among developed and developing countries, in the global south and for different groups (including women, disabled people, sexual minorities and indigenous people).

Across these regulatory systems public and private forms of accountability vary widely. These include private contractual remedies for consumers, corporate complaints systems, private dispute resolution including arbitration and mediation, public reporting of human rights violations to national, regional or global forums, private litigation against corporations, industry based codes of practice, public litigation against governments, public prosecutions by law enforcement for online criminal conduct, and civil litigation. Some or all of these forms of accountability may apply in a single situation (eg in cases of cyberstalking or government requests for removal online content or for private data).

These trends have internet public policy consequences that can be usefully explored at the IGF.

APC believes that the IGF is a powerful venue to look at the issue of the multiple, competing and sometimes conflicting avenues for accountability from diverse perspectives and to explore how to find principled ways to respond and ensure appropriate remedies and accountability across the internet ecosystem, from an internet governance perspective.

### **2.2 Conflict minerals and why they are important in internet governance**

Bringing accountability and governance to ICT production is one of the challenges that internet governance faces currently. In APC's view, it is crucial that the IGF pays attention to the issue of the ethical procurement of minerals from conflict-affected and high-risk areas. This has received global attention over time, but less public attention has been given to how conflict minerals feed into the ICT manufacturing supply chain.

We believe that the IGF should approach this issue by encouraging a deeper understanding of the challenges, raising awareness of guidelines and legislation that address issues of traceability, accountability and responsibility in the mineral procurement chain, highlighting existing initiatives that aim to prevent the use of conflict minerals, and proposing ways to end the use of conflict mineral in the production of ICTs.

### **2.3 Affordability, openness and network neutrality in the mobile internet**

The mobile internet has become increasingly affordable in recent years. However, as concludes Lisa Horner in a paper commissioned by APC<sup>3</sup>, the costs of accessing the mobile internet are still prohibitively high for the majority of people living in poor and marginalised communities

<sup>3</sup> Horner, L. "A human rights approach to the mobile internet". APC. May 2011. <http://www.apc.org/en/node/12431/>

across the world. This is a major reason why mobile internet subscriptions remain very low (3%) in developing countries, compared to 38.7% of the population in high-income countries. So while connectivity is improving, high prices, often stemming from licensing fees and competition issues, are preventing many people from using the services that are available. There is an urgent need for these issues to be addressed through communications policy and strategy.

Pricing models also have an impact on the range of content that low-income users can access through the mobile internet. A research study in South Africa in 2009<sup>4</sup> found that pricing models based on paying for byte of data transmitted affect people's experience and use. For example, with people using search engines to access targeted information quickly, while pricing plans that encourage people to engage in more open browsing of information on the web might result in people accessing more diverse content. The expansion of pre-paid plans that permit to predict costs is particularly important for low-income users.

## **2.4 Network neutrality**

Net neutrality, in its modern context, is the principle of letting all internet traffic flow equally and impartially without discrimination. It allows internet users to access any web content or applications they choose, without restriction or limitation<sup>5</sup>.

Some internet intermediaries claim that their business models (eg tiered-service models) should allow them to recover the investments required by the newer generation of bandwidth-hungry services and applications, and that they need to perform a certain degree of traffic management in order to ensure the quality of the service that they provide.

In order to create a healthy ecosystem, in which internet operators can function and offer their services reasonably without hampering the realisation and promotion of the users' rights, clear net neutrality regulations need to be established.

In particular, the relation between governments and internet intermediaries --and the role they can play in blocking or limiting content and services-- is an important aspect that needs to be considered in any net neutrality regulation. This is developed in more depth in point 4.1.

Net neutrality regulations should be oriented towards promoting consumer's rights. Therefore commercial practices that have negative impacts on them (eg those oriented towards removing competition, creating artificial scarcity and obliging subscribers to buy otherwise uncompetitive services) should not be allowed under any circumstances.

## **3. Managing critical internet resources**

### **3.1 Reform of internet governance institutions to ensure greater accountability, participation and transparency**

The gradual emergence of the issue of improving legitimacy, accountability and transparency in internet governance and its institutions is now broadly relevant to a great number of different and diverse stakeholders. The issue has reached a point where there is sufficient critical mass, importance and interest to warrant higher visibility in the IGF agenda, besides intersecting with a variety of issues.

<sup>4</sup> Donner, J. and Gitau, S. "New Paths: Exploring Mobile-only and Mobile-Primary Internet Use in South Africa".

<sup>5</sup> Lange, P. "Net neutrality". GISW. 2008. <http://www.giswatch.org/thematic-report/2008-access-infrastructure/net-neutrality>

For multi-stakeholder internet governance to serve the purposes of public interest in a legitimate and accountable way it has to acquire a meaning in practice for the multiple stakeholders. It is necessary to go “beyond the surface of multi-stakeholder participation and enable one to delve into the real politics of power and interest which intersects with multi-stakeholder processes in internet governance” (Anriette Esterhuysen, APC)<sup>6</sup>.

In addition multi-stakeholder governance institutions and processes have to relate to existing international rights instruments, standards and agreements. “The world, of which the internet is a part, is not an equal place. There are vast differences in access to resources and power, between countries, and within countries. Governance bodies and processes need to recognise these differences, and try to redress them to achieve legitimacy over time [...]”<sup>7</sup>.

APC would like to see these issues addressed and debated free from bias in the IGF. Over the years, there have been suggestions for sessions to review the performance of the organisations that are responsible for critical internet resources as measured against the Tunis Agenda mandate<sup>8</sup>. APC would like to see these sessions included in the schedule for 2012 with sessions on ICANN and the regional internet registries.

### **3.2 The ICANN reform process**

ICANN has a by-laws mandated requirement for periodic review and reform. This requirement was reinforced in 2009 by the Affirmation of Commitments agreement with the US Department of Commerce<sup>9</sup>. The agreement commits ICANN to periodic reviews on topics such as accountability, transparency and participation. The first of these reviews on accountability and transparency was completed in 2010 and made 27 recommendations for change. ICANN is now implementing the recommendations and maintains a website<sup>10</sup> to track its progress. There is however no external oversight. The IGF is well-suited and timely for carrying out a check-point assessment on ICANN's progress. APC would like to see this included as one of the topics during the main session on critical internet resources.

## **4. Security, openness and privacy**

### **4.1 Internet intermediary liability**

Ambivalence towards intermediary liability has not been sorted out yet in internet public policy debates. APC, along with other members of the Civil Society Information Society Advisory Council to the OECD (CSISAC) expressed concern about the “unmistakable ambivalence towards intermediary liability”<sup>11</sup> in the OECD Communiqué on Principles for Internet Policy-Making.

The Communiqué states that “internet intermediaries, like other stakeholders, can and do play an important role by addressing and deterring illegal activity”. APC believes that this is a dangerous idea as intermediaries are neither equipped nor qualified to enact policy, especially around sensitive issues like freedom of expression.

On this subject the June report<sup>12</sup> of the UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression Frank La Rue notes that “[t]he range of services offered by intermediaries has flourished over the

<sup>6</sup> APC's Anriette Esterhuysen's response in *In their respective roles*, Bertrand de la Chapelle, MIND

<sup>7</sup> Idem.

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.itu.int/wsis/documents/doc\\_multi.asp?lang=en&id=2266|2267](http://www.itu.int/wsis/documents/doc_multi.asp?lang=en&id=2266|2267)

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.icann.org/en/affirmation/>

<sup>10</sup> <http://aoctracking.icann.org>

<sup>11</sup> [http://csisac.org/CSISAC\\_PR\\_06292011.pdf](http://csisac.org/CSISAC_PR_06292011.pdf) [http://www.oecd.org/document/48/0,3746,en\\_21571361\\_44315115\\_48289776\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/48/0,3746,en_21571361_44315115_48289776_1_1_1_1,00.html)

<sup>12</sup> [http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/17session/A.HRC.17.27\\_en.pdf](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/17session/A.HRC.17.27_en.pdf)

past decade, mainly due to the legal protection that they have enjoyed from liability for third-party content". His report goes on to conclude that "intermediaries, as private entities, are not best placed to make the determination of whether a particular content is illegal, which requires careful balancing of competing interests and consideration of defences".

The UN Special Rapporteur and APC believe that the restriction of content should never be delegated to a private entity. Besides, the promotion of the public interest as a primary internet policy-making principle is an unavoidable task for the IGF.

#### **4.2 Impact of internet restrictions in freedom of expression and association online**

The links between ICTs, human rights and democratisation are undeniable. But these are also under increasing and significant threat, not only in undemocratic states, but in all states where the diverse forms of democracy continue to evolve. Freedom of expression does not matter more than freedom of association – the two are inextricably linked and interdependent. And ICTs strengthen the processes of communications and information sharing and organising. For these effects to be sustainable we must be alert to the new challenges and the ever-shifting contexts both online and offline in which those processes are taking place.

The increasing use of human rights arguments by states as rationale for controlling access to the internet demands responses from human rights defenders (HRDs), policy-makers and civil society. Leslie Cowling states in an APC research study on the potential of ICTs for enhancing democracy<sup>13</sup>:

"While new ICTs make human rights violations possible by states, corporations and individuals with fraudulent intent, these violations are not inherent and inevitable consequences of the technologies themselves. Rather, the new forms of human rights violations are the effect of (politically) expedient decisions by states and non-state actors to impact on ICT users in this way, and are similar in intent to violations experienced in traditional media. This makes the state vulnerable to countervailing actions and campaigns – such as the emerging internet rights campaigns – to bolster human rights in the information society, using international protocols and human rights instruments and policing mechanisms."

These issues rock the very foundations of the IGF. APC urges that human rights be designated the main theme of the IGF in 2012 so that they be explored in multi-faceted ways and from multi-stakeholder perspectives.

Additionally, we believe that the IGF should keep addressing and respond to the increasing concern about attempts by governments to limit access to online content published by whistle-blowing and leaking websites. Respect for freedom of expression and access to information means that any government is obliged to refrain from taking action against whistle-blowing sites and the individuals behind them. APC believes that the ability to share information and communicate freely using the internet is vital to the realisation of human rights and to efforts to use the internet to contribute more accountable and transparent governance at global and national levels. Whistle-blowing and leaking websites can play a crucial role in aiding the fight against corruption in governments and corporations, contribute to more transparent governance and empower citizens to hold their government accountable.

#### **4.3 Responding to online violence against women**

Today's reality is that violence against women occurs in both physical and online spaces. Since January 2009 APC has been researching both the policy and physical environment of the internet, mobile phone and technology related violence committed against women and girls in

<sup>13</sup> *ICTs for democracy: Information and Communication Technologies for the Enhancement of Democracy - with a Focus on Empowerment* by APC for Swedish International Development Agency 2009 [http://www.apc.org/en/system/files/SIDA\\_ICTs%20for%20Democracy.pdf](http://www.apc.org/en/system/files/SIDA_ICTs%20for%20Democracy.pdf)

12 developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. This includes increasing cases of cyberstalking, online harassment, manipulation of images that impacts severely on reputation and violation of privacy and/or blackmail through actual or threats of dissemination of personal content such as private correspondence, photographs and videos - all of which disproportionately affects women<sup>14</sup>.

However, while these abuses are becoming more common, abusers largely go unchecked because of the lack of knowledge about the nature of abuses and what can be done to prevent them from both a user and a policy perspective. Despite the severity and increase in these violations technology related violence against women has not featured on the IGF agenda in a meaningful way.

APC believes that addressing violence against women is an urgent priority that demands the attention of all stakeholders involved in internet governance. A response is needed that will require a clearer sense of the duties, responsibilities and liabilities of both state and non-state actors as well as the mechanisms, processes and platforms of accountability.

## 5. Access and diversity

### ***5.1 Open spectrum and television white spaces: Creative regulation of frequency as a means of bridging the access gap***

The impact of the explosion of wireless internet access through mobile devices in bridging the access gap and alternatives approaches to spectrum allocation in the context of digital migration are issues that need to be brought to the fore of the IGF policy debate.

As Steve Song indicates in his paper for APC<sup>15</sup> the evolution of wireless technologies has brought us to a point where alternative approaches to spectrum regulation may be realistically considered to give response to a demand for access that is accelerating dramatically in the developing world.

While the transition to digital broadcasting presents logistical, political and technical challenges the benefits go well beyond clearer reception and more channels. Arguably the biggest benefit of the move to digital terrestrial broadcasting is in the large quantity of spectrum that will be freed up for other uses.

Wireless technology has also evolved to the point where it can operate efficiently within bands that were originally guarded to avoid interference in television broadcast (known as TV white spaces). In the USA last year the Federal Communications Commission approved TV white spaces spectrum for unlicensed use. This year the UK regulator authorised trials. TV white space devices can select spectrum by sensing free channels or through a centrally-managed database that can enable devices in appropriate areas. Thus as long as these devices comply with regulatory standards, they would not require a spectrum licence. This opens up possibilities for entrepreneurship in rural broadband delivery and for the kind of innovation that has built a multi-billion dollar Wi-Fi industry on a small chunk of unlicensed spectrum.

As wireless technology becomes more and more sophisticated, we see more and more ways in which spectrum can be shared. Location, time, proximity, power-output and orientation are all

<sup>14</sup> For example, in India, Delhi police note that of all cybercrime cases reported almost half are filed by women who discover their faces morphed onto pornographic images and posted online, usually accompanied by a personal phone number and an invitation for strangers to call. Similarly in the Philippines the cybercrime unit operating in Manila noted that 70% of complaints they receive are about abusive behaviour experienced by women and girls.

<sup>15</sup> *Spectrum for development*, Steve Song, APC 2011 <http://www.apc.org/en/node/12949/>. Also see <http://www.apc.org/en/projects/open-spectrum-development>



factors which can create an opportunity for spectrum sharing through some combination of geo-location databases, spectrum sensing and/or other interference management technologies. While cognitive radio still has a long way to go to achieve its full potential, it is clear that this is the direction in which wireless technology is heading.

Spectrum regulation needs to make space to allow these technologies to flourish. This is a policy issue with potentially direct impact on affordability and ubiquity of access.

## **5.2 Access to knowledge**

APC's research on media piracy in South Africa<sup>16</sup> shows that intellectual property laws can represent a significant barrier to access to information and culture especially in poor communities. And that the debate surrounding intellectual property too often reveals an overwhelming bias towards enforcement — including the extension of criminal penalties, increasing of police powers, streamlining of the judicial process and increasing surveillance of the internet.

The research, which was produced for Media Piracy in Emerging Economies<sup>17</sup> by the Social Sciences Research Council, found that a narrow focus on the criminal aspect of the violation of intellectual property is “increasingly counterproductive for all parties, from developing-country governments, to consumers, to the copyright interests that drive the global enforcement debate.”

APC believes the approach to intellectual property issues should be more nuanced. Creators of content have rights that need to be protected – should they so wish. But the enormous potential of the internet to increase the development and sharing of knowledge should not be put at risk through the enacting of overly-stringent laws — an approach we note is favoured mostly by large corporations rather than individual creators.

APC has seen with concern the statement in the OECD's Communique on Principles for Internet-Policy Making on that intellectual property protection is a “fundamental tool for the advancement of innovation and creativity on the Internet”.

In our estimation much of the internet's success is the result of the open source, collaborative efforts of unpaid volunteers contributing to a global information commons. Anyone involved in the development of the internet over the last twenty years knows that transgression has probably been a far greater driver of innovation than IP protection.

We do not want to imply that illegal use of content is a sustainable alternative. What we believe is that policy-makers should focus on keeping the internet open, encouraging its potential for strengthening the information and knowledge commons. And let those with business interests on the internet apply their resources and creativity to come up with models that thrive on openness rather than on restrictions. The Washington Declaration on Intellectual Property<sup>18</sup> offers a good set of recommendations for action by the international community for the prevalence of the public internet on this field.

APC thinks that the IGF 2011 should emphasise the need to discuss access to knowledge balancing IPR and the needs of developing countries. The recommendations made by policymakers and advocates

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.apc.org/en/news/media-piracy-south-africa>

<sup>17</sup> <http://piracy.ssrc.org/the-report/>

<sup>18</sup> <http://infojustice.org/washington-declaration>

## 6. Cross-cutting issues

### **6.1 Human rights approach to internet governance: The relationship between human rights and internet regulatory environments**

There is increasing awareness and understanding in the internet governance community of the links between internet governance and human rights. This is evident from the enhanced presence of human rights discussions at the global IGF and also at regional IGFs. Even if not enough yet, we also see an increase in interest by the mainstream human rights community.

In our view, internet rights are not new rights. It is a term referring to the application of existing rights standards to any person who accesses the internet (or wants to access it but is unable to). It also refers to the application of those standards to the policy and regulatory environments in which the internet functions and develops. The adoption of a rights-based approach to internet governance will benefit huge numbers of people. It will also open up effective ways to provide recourse to accountability mechanisms that are not currently available within the wider internet ecosystem.

Given that the internet has a key role in the realisation of a broad range of human rights we hope that the IGF will adopt human rights as the main theme for the IGF 2012 and that the space to discuss these issues will continue to grow at the IGF.

### **6.2 Capacity building, particularly of stakeholders from developing countries**

For the internet to continue to evolve as a public space under public control, it is crucial that all stakeholders, particularly the ones from developing countries, are able to engage effectively with the multiple and complex processes, issues and institutions related to internet governance. An important part of the legitimacy of global internet policy and governance processes lies in the ability and capacity of the multiple stakeholders to participate in decision-making and making. Therefore the capacity of stakeholders for the public sector, civil society, users, technical community and business from developing countries to take active part in internet governance has to be increased.

The IGF has an important role to play in that regard by reaching out delegates from developing countries through securing financial support for them to participate in the global process, strengthening remote participation as a way for enhanced participation and encouraging the realisation of regional and national IGFs, among other measures.

## 7. Other issues

### **7.1 The evolution, strengthening and impact of the national and regional IGFs**

There is a general consensus that regional and national processes should be strengthened and that their link with the global space should be flexible rather than formal, allowing these processes to follow their own dynamics and respond to their regional or national priorities. The MAG should however encourage national and regional IGF-related processes to contribute to the open consultations to ensure that the priorities identified at those levels are taken into account when building the global IGF agenda. We urge national and regional IGFs to be as inclusive as possible and to respect the WSIS principles at all times. We also suggest that convenors of national and regional IGFs produce reports which feed the main session on regional perspectives and be tabled in pre-events, workshops and other sessions.

### **7.2 IGF improvements and the CSTD working group**

ECOSOC's approval of an extension of the mandate of the working group on IGF improvements is positive. We urge the CSTD Secretariat and Bureau to finalise the Working Group on the Improvements to the IGF's work procedures and timetable as soon as possible. During its initial term the Working Group received a rich collection of proposals for making the IGF more effective as a forum for dialogue that can indirectly influence policy and inter-institutional dialogue. There was broad consensus among members on the value and role of the IGF as a multi-stakeholder forum that can influence policies and build capacities, but that should not make policy. Divergences of views among Working Group members centred on the constitution of the MAG and the capturing of discussions at the IGF. We believe that with effective chairing and the use of a skilled facilitator members will be able to agree on recommendations for improving the IGF.

APC hopes that a recommendation be made that the IGF communicates the most salient outcomes of main sessions and workshops. We would support such a recommendation as we believe that it will not compromise the non-binding non-decision-making character of the IGF but will significantly facilitate and encourage more straight-forward collaborative actions.

## APC's presence at the IGF

<b>Pre-IGF Event from APC - September 26</b>	
Workshop Room 5 10:00-18:00	<b>Internet Rights are Human Rights: Development, Empowerment and Access to the Internet</b> <i>Organised by APC</i>
<b>IGF Day One - September 27</b>	
Main Session Room (Conference Room #2) 11:00-12:30	<b>Internet Governance for Development</b> <i>Main Session</i> <i>APC Speakers: Joy Liddicoat</i>
<b>IGF Day Two - September 28</b>	
Workshop Room 9 (Conference Room #4) 9:00-10:30	<b>Mapping Internet Governance</b> <i>Organised by IGC</i> <i>APC Partner: David Souter</i>
Workshop Room 2 (Conference Room #9) 11:00-12:30	<b>Do Policy Makers Understand the Role of Libraries in Mobilizing the Internet as a Catalyst for Development, Innovation and Freedom?</b> <i>Organised by EIFL. Co-hosted by APC</i>
Workshop Room 6 (Conference Room #13) 11:00-12:30	<b>Blocking Content: Issues, Principles and Paths Forward</b> <i>Organised by ISOC. Co-hosted by APC</i>
Workshop Room 6 (Conference Room #13) 16:30-18:00	<b>Mobile Internet, its Regulation and its Connection with Internet Governance / Mobile Internet: Enhancing the New Age of the Internet</b> <i>Organised by Nokia. Co-hosted by APC</i>
Workshop Room 2 (Conference Room #9) 16:30-18:00	<b>Internet Governance Principles: Initiatives Toward the Improvement of a Global Internet Governance</b> <i>Organised by Center for Technology and Society</i> <i>APC Speakers: Joy Liddicoat</i>
Workshop Room 3 (Conference Room #10) 16:30-18:00	<b>A Practical and Pragmatic Look at Making Cloud Successful in the Developing World</b> <i>Organised by GIIC and WITSA</i> <i>APC Speakers: Joy Liddicoat</i>
<b>IGF Day Three - September 29</b>	
Workshop Room 6 (Conference Room #13) 11:00-12:30	<b>What is the Role of the Media in Ensuring the Internet is a Resilient and Stable Platform?</b> <i>Organised by The BBC. Co-hosted by APC.</i>
Workshop Room 2 (Conference Room #9) 11:00-12:30	<b>Human rights: a unifying approach for development, freedom, access and diversity?</b> <i>Organised by APC</i>
Workshop Room 2 (Conference Room #9) 14:30-16:00	<b>Institutional Choice in Global Internet Governance</b> <i>Organised by University of Zurich</i> <i>APC Speakers: Anriette Esterhuysen</i>
Workshop Room 8 (Conference Room #3) 16:30-18:00	<b>Open Spectrum for Development in the Context of the Digital Migration</b> <i>Organised by APC</i>
Main Session Room (Conference Room #2) 11:00-13:00	<b>Critical Internet Resources</b> <i>Main Session</i> <i>APC Speakers: Anriette Esterhuysen</i>
Main Session Room (Conference Room #2) 14:30-16:00	<b>Taking Stock and the Way Forward</b> <i>Main Session</i> <i>APC Speakers: Anriette Esterhuysen (moderator) / Valeria Betancourt (remote moderator)</i>
Workshop Room 3 (Conference Room #3) 16:30-18:00	<b>Multistakeholder Internet Public Policy Dialogue: Lessons Learned and Best Practice Examples of Local to Global Policy Dialogue</b> <i>Organised by IISD. APC Speakers: Valeria Betancourt</i>

## **APC online**

APC staff and members will be doing onsite coverage in English, Spanish and French. We'll be tweeting using #igf11 and #genderigf. Also find us on Facebook <http://www.facebook.com/APCNews> in English and APCNoticias and APCNouvelles in French. For more information visit [www.apc.org](http://www.apc.org) and [genderit.org](http://genderit.org).

## **APC staff at the IGF2010**

- Anriette Esterhuysen, executive director
- Valeria Betancourt, policy programme manager
- Joy Liddicoat, Internet Rights are Human Rights project coordinator
- Henrik Almstrom, internet rights monitor
- Pablo Accuosto, policy research coordinator
- Chat Garcia Ramilo, women's programme manager
- Jac sm Kee, women's rights advocacy coordinator
- Jan Moolman, women's programme and MDG3
- Jennifer Radloff, women's programme and human rights training
- Dafne Sabanes Plou, Latin American women's programme coordinator
- Alan Finlay, ICTs and environment
- Karel Novotny, knowledge coordinator
- Grady Johnson, communications and media [grady@apc.org](mailto:grady@apc.org)
- Erika Smith, women's programme communications

## **APC members at the IGF**

- Bala Bidi Dada, Fantsuam Foundation (Nigeria)
- David Barnard, SANGONeT (South Africa)
- Grace Githaiga, KICTANeT (Kenya)
- Graciela Selaimen and Carlos Afonso, NUPEF (Brazil)
- James Nguo, Arid Lands Information Network Eastern Africa (Kenya)
- Shahzad Ahmad and Nighat Daad, Bytes For All (Pakistan)
- Lillian Nalwoga, CIPESA (Uganda)
- Moshahida Sultana, BFES (Bangladesh)
- Sylvie Niombo, Azur Developpment (Republic of Congo).

## **PRESS**

To contact APC for interviews write to [khiggs@apc.org](mailto:khiggs@apc.org) or visit the APC booth in the IGF exhibition centre and coordinate with Grady Johnson, APC communications [grady@apc.org](mailto:grady@apc.org).