Internet Governance
Internet is:

- a complex environment involving many aspects of social life;
- is used by different users;
- is global environment.

“Internet is an ecosystem” Vinton Cerf
World Internet users by regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>975,330,899</td>
<td>4,514,400</td>
<td>54,171,500</td>
<td>5.6 %</td>
<td>1,100.0 %</td>
<td>3.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>3,780,819,792</td>
<td>114,304,000</td>
<td>657,170,816</td>
<td>17.4 %</td>
<td>474.9 %</td>
<td>41.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>803,903,540</td>
<td>105,096,093</td>
<td>393,373,398</td>
<td>48.9 %</td>
<td>274.3 %</td>
<td>24.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>196,767,614</td>
<td>3,284,800</td>
<td>45,861,346</td>
<td>23.3 %</td>
<td>1,296.2 %</td>
<td>2.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>337,572,949</td>
<td>108,096,800</td>
<td>251,290,489</td>
<td>74.4 %</td>
<td>132.5 %</td>
<td>15.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America/Caribbean</td>
<td>581,249,892</td>
<td>18,068,919</td>
<td>173,619,140</td>
<td>29.9 %</td>
<td>860.9 %</td>
<td>10.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania/Australia</td>
<td>34,384,384</td>
<td>7,620,480</td>
<td>20,783,419</td>
<td>60.4 %</td>
<td>172.7 %</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORLD TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,710,029,070</strong></td>
<td><strong>360,985,492</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,596,270,108</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.8 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>342.2 %</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internet Usage and World Population Statistics are for March 31, 2009
www.internetworldstats.com

Antonella Giulia Pizzaleo, 11 November 2009
World Internet users by regions

Source: Internet World Stats - www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm
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What is Internet Governance?

Akash Kapur
*Internet Governance - A Primer*
(Foreword by Vinton Cerf)
© UNDP-APDIP, 2005
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"The Internet has become the backbone of our globalized world. It is a powerful tool that can assist us in our efforts to promote peace and security, as well as development and human rights. Given the tremendous potential of the Internet to change our lives, it is no wonder that people take an interest in how it is being run and managed. What has become known as ‘Internet governance’ has thus become a new issue on the agenda of international cooperation. The Internet is a new technology and its governance is as innovative as its underlying codes and protocols. In essence, Internet governance is based on collaboration between all stakeholders."

Sha Zukang, Under-Secretary-General, United Nations Department of economic and social affairs

Antonella Giulia Pizzaleo, 11 November 2009
"In managing, promoting, and protecting its presence in our lives, we need to be no less creative than those who invented it. Clearly, there is a need for governance, but that does not necessarily mean that it has to be done in the traditional way, for something that is so very different."
Internet Governance is the development and application by Governments, the private sector and civil society, in their respective roles, of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programmes that shape the evolution and use of the Internet.

**Working Definition – Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG - 2005)**
What is Internet Governance?

Crucial Point: develop a common understanding of the respective roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders from both developed and developing Countries.

**Governments:** include public policymaking, coordination & implementation, as appropriate, at the national level, and policy development and coordination at the regional and international levels.

**Private Sector:** include contribution to the policy proposals, apply self – regulation rules, promote research and development of technologies.

**Civil Society:** include awareness raising and capacity building, helping ensure that political and market forces are accountable to the needs of all members of society, development and dissemination of best practices.
Why do we need Internet Governance?

- Rapid increase of Internet users
- Prevent or minimize the risk of fragmentation of the Internet
- Maintain compatibility and interoperability
- Safeguard the rights and define responsibilities of various users
- Protect end users from misuse and abuse
- Encourage further development
Internet Governance: some public policy issues

- **Relating to Infrastructure and Management of critical Internet Resources**
  Telecommunication infrastructure, broadband, convergence, VoIP, technical standards, administration of names and numbers, root server system, international domain names (IDNs).

- **Relating to the use of Internet**
  Spam, cybersecurity, cybercrime, critical infrastructure protection, network security, national policies and regulation.

- **Relating to a wider social interest**
  Authentication, privacy, consumer protection, intellectual property, e-commerce, freedom of information and media, competition policy, dispute resolution, unlawful content.

- **Relating to the developmental aspects of Internet capacity**
  Cost of access, universal access, capacity building, national infrastructure development, content accessibility, Floss, cultural and linguistic diversity, social inclusion, stability and security of infrastructure.
Internet Governance: some problems to overcome

- Unilateral control by one country in some pivotal issues
- Uneven distribution of costs
- Lack of multilateral mechanisms on crucial matters
- Lack of efficient enforcement tools in other jurisdictions
- Lack of unified approach on crucial matters – difficulty to balance interests
Traditional regulatory approaches show their inadequacy and insufficiency when dealing effectively with global legal issues related to the Internet. There are three traditional regulation models, each of them relevant to Internet in its own particular way.

1. **The self-regulation approach**
   It conceptualizes the Net as a post-territorial place, released from state sovereignty. Originally the Internet developed out of a traditional legal framework and was mainly based on self-regulation by technical communities and its users. These actors have often considered the Internet regulation by traditional legal agencies as dangerous for the Net. This approach is proven to be risky for three main reasons at least: cyberspace cannot be disassociated from real space and physical territories; by stating that the Net should not be regulated, we are exposing it to the risk of supremacy of the strongest actor or interest; states in the Internet regulation are just present.
2. The unilateral approach
It is based on the juxtaposition of state sovereignty and often generates conflicts. The exercise of state authority on Internet is irreparably limited by technical reasons; but it is already proven in Internet and, related to some specific aspects, it is necessary.

3. The international law
The international law would be the most appropriate framework for Internet governance: it is the only one that has the possibility of coping with questions that overcome national boundaries, harmonizing different approaches and goals. Currently, it is not fully equipped to face the new questions posed by the Net, in particular its multi-stakeholders and bottom-up dynamics. The international approach lacks a fundamental basis of laws and a supra-national judicial body. The international approach will be more effective concerning Internet governance, if it will become more and more a common platform for all stakeholders, instead of simply being a relationship among states. In other words, the Internet needs of governance rather than government.
Governance instead of government

- Governance is not synonymous with government [...] governance is a broader phenomenon of government, which embraces governmental institutions but also subsumes the informal and non-governmental mechanisms”.

- Governance is a set of “interactions, complex and diverse to form a hybrid structure in which the dynamics governance intersect at various levels to form a network process, such as the Möbius ring that does not begin or end at any level or at some point”.

  James Rosenau, former President of the International Studies Association
"In the last few years the obscurity of science has been shattered by a new approach which touches on many immediate and current problems we care about: how our minds work, how family relationships work, how to organize a business, how society works, how the environment can be protected, how to improve medical care, how effective third world development can be achieved. While scientists continue to learn and debate the opportunities that this new approach can yield, many people, both scientists and non-scientists, are revealing in the new perspectives and insights being gained."

Yaneer Bar-Yam, Professor at New England Complex Systems Institute
At the core of different applications of the theory of complexity lies the substitution of a reductionist paradigm for a complex one. Regarding the reductionist approach, in general, a system is analysable and comprehensible, because it is composed of many single components. Instead, the main relevant factor in a complex system is the wholeness. The wholeness is something denser than and different from the sum of its parts. These parts are interacted and interconnected in a far-from-simple and non-linear way. Their relationship is organized like a web.
Examples of complex systems:
- social and economic structures;
- the spreading of a virus and the swift rate of infection;
- the domino effect of financial crisis;
- the development of a city;
- the human neurological systems;
- the ant or bees colonies;
- collaborative tagging and social bookmarking systems;
- energy or telecommunication infrastructure.
And last but not least, the growth of globalization dynamics.

There are several kinds of complex systems, the most widely analysed ones being: chaotic systems, non-linear systems - more related to physics and mathematics - and complex adaptive systems that include the above-mentioned list.
Analyzing the characteristics of the Internet, we can see that the Net shares distinctive features with complex adaptive systems, both at an infrastructural and management level:

- systemic interdependence of heterogeneous agents (stakeholders), which are by self complex systems and changes their behavior in dynamic processes;

- presence of bottom-up dynamics, and consequent emergent behavior, which are non-formal and often “creative”, far from consolidated solutions (as Dynamic Coalitions);

- co-evolution of these systems;
isomorphism of its dynamics with the subject of the investigation (the Internet);

- high importance of a dynamic coordination system of relationships (the role played by IGF);

- need for an agile, multi-centred and networked pattern of relation instead of a vertical transposition (rules *octroyé*);

- need to maintain the equilibrium between closing of individual systems, too much ordered (e.g. due to lacks of communication or of coordinated and shared action) and too much chaotic initiatives and actions, related to much different goals.
A new model of authority

Decision making or decision shaping?
In Internet governance some models and forms of authority are needed - although different from the hierarchical systems - to avoid the chaotic interaction among its elements. In a complex system, as Internet governance is, the authoritativeness are due to mutual recognition and consensus, and shared practices, as well as to the contribution's intensity into the process.

Probably in IGF process we have to find new ways to enforce these non formalized nodes of authority.
A new concept of space

We probably need new theoretical and practical tools to create out of a central space, even if always in relation with local spaces. The theory of complexity’s issue of co-evolution suggests that systems need to evolve together: both in local and global dimensions. In other words, according to Rosenau, we have to manage a peculiar characteristic of our age: “fragmegration” (fragmentation plus integration).

This renewal of the concept of space could help IGF process to avoid the so-called butterfly-effect (unpredictable effects due to an action and consequent dominum effect, apparently far from or not relevant for the whole process).

Above all, an innovative management of space would help us to cope with the problem of accountability (the acknowledgement and assumption of responsibility for actions, products, decisions and policies within the scope of the designated role).
Before Internet Governance Forum:
World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS)

- **Geneva 2003**
  Geneva Declaration of Principles
  www.itu.int/wsis/docs/geneva/official/dop.html
  Geneva Plan of Action
  www.itu.int/wsis/docs/geneva/official/poa.html

- **Tunis 2005**
  Tunis Commitment
  www.itu.int/wsis/docs2/tunis/off/7.html
  Tunis Agenda for the Information Society
  www.itu.int/wsis/docs2/tunis/off/6rev1.html
Before Internet Governance Forum:
World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS)

WSIS and Internet

- WSIS reaffirmed that the international management of the Internet should be multilateral, transparent and democratic, with the full involvement of governments, private sector, civil society and International Organizations.

Internet Governance Forum (IGF) → Enhanced Cooperation → Multi-stakeholder approach
Meetings

- 2006: Athens, Greece
- 2007: Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
- 2008: Hyderabad, India
- 2009: Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt
- 2010: Vilnius, Lithuania
- and then?

www.intgovforum.org
Internet Governance Forum main sessions

- Openness
- Security
- Diversity
- Access
- Internet Critical Resources
- Emerging Issues
“The Internet Governance Forum is an experiment in global governance. It does not have a pre-defined membership. It is open to anyone - governments, civil society, the corporate sector, the Internet technology community, in fact to anyone who has an interest and the competence to contribute. Come as you are but come with something to offer is what it says. It is an open access forum not designed to take decisions but to function as a space for airing different views and stimulating dialogue and discussion. It is a bit like a village or town meeting giving voice to the users of the net and helping to identify emerging issues.”
IGF is not a policy-making body; it is a multi-stakeholder and multilevel open forum for:

- dialogue;
- share experiences;
- highlight issues of concern;
- build relationships and collaborate by Dynamic Coalitions.
It was generally felt that the Dynamic Coalitions that emerged from the Athens meeting had been a great innovation and in many ways become a distinctive feature of the IGF. Dynamic Coalitions could also broaden its impact. One speaker held the view that they were what he called “a central component of the fact that the IGF is not only an annual event but also a process”.

www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php/dynamiccoalitions
Several IGF related meetings took place at the regional and national level in 2008. Some of them:

- East African IGF (EAIGF): www.eaigf.or.ke
- European Dialogue on Internet Governance (EuroDig): www.eurodig.org
- Latin American and Caribbean IGF: lirne.net/2008/09/regional-igf-online-debate
- United Kingdom IGF: www.ukigf.org.uk
- West African IGF: blogs.haayo.org/westafict
- Spanish IGF: www.igf-spain.com
- Italy IGF: www.igf-italia.it
Costituito il Comitato dei promotori dello IGF Italia

Il Comitato promotore definirà il modello organizzativo dello IGF Italia mediante una discussione aperta con tutti i portatori d'interesse (stakeholder) della Rete in Italia. Tutti sono invitati ad aderire ad IGF Italia, sia in forma singola (persone fisiche), sia associata (istituzioni, enti, aziende, associazioni, ...). Composizione del Comitato:

Laura Abba, Dirigente CNR, Istituto IIT
Vittorio Bertola, ISOC Italia
Fiorello Cortiana, Settore Innovazione Provincia di Milano
Giulio De Petra, Regione Autonoma della Sardegna
Matilde Ferraro, Esperta di Digital Divide
Joy Marino, Milan Internet eXchange
Antonio Mazzeo, Università di Napoli
Antonella Giulia Pizzaleo, Esperta di governance di Internet
Stefano Rodota, Professore Università Sapienza di Roma (Presidente del Comitato Promotore)
Stefano Trumpy, Presidente ISOC Italia

Il Comitato è contattabile via mail.
• 2006, 2007, 2008: participation to Internet Governance Forum (2007: Joint Declaration Italy -Brazil)

• 2007: Dialogue Forum on Internet Rights, Rome
  www.dfiritaly2007.it

• 2008: Dialogue Forum on Internet Rights II, Cagliari
• 2008: Internet Governance Forum Italia, Cagliari
  www.towardsg8-2009.it/eventi/internetgovernance

• 2009 Internet Governance Forum Italia, Pisa
  www.igf-italia.it
Dynamic Coalition on the Internet Bill of Rights

Aims: the Dynamic Coalition on Internet Rights and Principles is an informal, open group of organizations, companies, governments and individuals that feel the need to work together for a better definition of the rights and duties of the individual users of the Internet.

Active Participants:
- Government of Brazil, Ministry of Culture
- Government of Italy, Ministry of Reform and Innovation in the Public Administration
- Government of France, French Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs
- Government of Argentina
- Swiss Federal Office of Communication (OFCOM)
- Advisor to Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Argentina
- Google Inc.
- UNESCO
- Centre for Technology and Society of Getulio Vargas Foundation School of Law, Brazil
- IP Justice, United States
- Società Internet (ISOC Italy), Italy
- Free Software Foundation Europe
- Committee for a Democratic United Nations, Germany
- Institute of International Law, University of Graz, Austria
- Net Dialogue Project, Universities of Harvard and Stanford, United States

internetrightsandprinciples.org
Italian Governments

Italian Government interest to the Internet Governance begun during XIII Leg., when it was established the COESIN, with DPCM 27.12.1999 (Min. D'Alema).

The Consultation Table with the Civil Society during the WSIS 2005 was the first institutional support to multistakeholder dialogue (XIV Leg. Min. Stanca).

During the XV Leg. it was established the Advisory Board on Internet Governance, to support the Minister to define governmental policy on Internet and Ict (Min. Nicolais).

In the XVI Leg. the Government commitment on Internet Governance is confirmed (Min. Brunetta).
Antonella Giulia Pizzaleo, 11 November 2009

«... Siamo convinti che su temi di questa portata non si possa prescindere da una dimensione partecipativa democratica, inclusiva e centrata sulle persone. Crediamo molto in questo approccio bottom-up ...»
Ministro Stanca - XIV Legislatura (2001-2006)

«... di particolare delicatezza in questo dibattito è il tema del ruolo dei Governi. La posizione del Governo italiano, ...., è che NON spetta ai Governi gestire Internet ..»
Ministro Nicolais - XV Legislatura (2006-2008)

«.... Proprio per questa estrema rilevanza e pervasività di Internet, è fondamentale occuparsi della sua governance. Non per imbrigliare la Rete ma per preservarne la pluralità e permettere a tutti i portatori di interesse di trarne vantaggio....»
Ministro Brunetta - XVI legislatura (2008 - in corso)

Source: Laura Abba - Isoc Italia
Internet Governance Forum: free publications

Internet Governance - Issues, Actors and Divides
Eduardo Gelbstein and Jovan Kurbalija
http://www.diplomacy.edu/ISL/IG/default.htm

Internet Governance - A Primer
Akash Kapur (Foreword by: Vinton G. Cerf)

Report on Internet Governance
EICN, European Internet Coregulation Network, 2005

On the Future of Internet Governance
Tim Wu, Esther Dyson, Michael Froomkin, David Gross
http://ssrn.com/abstract=992805

Internet Governance: Exploring the development kit
Wiliams, Howard Communications & Strategies, 2005

Models of Internet Governance
Lawrence B. Solum, University of Illinois – College of Law
http://ssrn.com/abstract=1136825
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Internet Governance Forum: free publications

A legal Analysis of the Internet Governance Forum process
Francis Muguet (ENSTA), WTIS-EUROLINK, 2007

Internet Governance Forum: A development perspective
A primer for the third meeting, Hyderabad, India, 3–6 December, 2008,

Defining ICT Global Governance
William J. Drake, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development
http://mediaresearchhub.ssrc.org/defining-ict-global-governance/attachment

Internet Governance. A Review in the Context of the WSIS Process
Carlos A. Afonso, Instituto del Tercer Mundo (IteM), 2005

Internet Governance and the Emergence of Global Civil Society

Internet Governance Forum (IGF) - The First Two Years
Edited by Avri Doria and Wolfgang Kleinwächter in cooperation with the IGF Secretariat
http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/hydera/IGFBook_the_first_two_years.pdf

Antonella Giulia Pizzaleo, 11 November 2009
Thanks for your attention!

Antonella Giulia Pizzaleo
pizzaleo@gmail.com
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