
This is a pre-print version of a paper published in the journal "Policy & Internet"

Please do not post or distribute.

Epstein, D. and Nonnecke, B. M. (2016). Multistakeholderism in praxis: The case of the regional and national IGF initiatives. *Policy & Internet*, 8(2), 148-173.
doi:10.1002/poi3.116

For quoting, please consult the final version.

Multistakeholderism in praxis:

The case of the regional and national IGF initiatives

Dmitry Epstein – Department of Communication, University of Illinois at Chicago

Brandie Nonnecke – Center for Information Technology Research in the Internet of Society,
University of California, Berkeley

Abstract

The growing phenomena of regional and national Internet Governance Forum (IGF) initiatives offer an interesting opportunity to look into how various interpretations of the multistakeholder model play out in different cultural, political, and economic settings. The variety of ways in which the multistakeholder model is enacted are expressed through the organizational structures and procedures of these events, their funding mechanisms, their agendas and formats, the kind of participation they attract and enable, and their potential influence on the national, regional, or global Internet governance debates. This paper is a systematic attempt to map out regional and national IGF initiatives with an emphasis on how the multistakeholder model is playing out in various contexts. In addition to the bird's eye view of the phenomenon, this paper also offers an in-depth analysis of the East African IGF as a case study of multistakeholderism in practice. This analysis builds on existing dispersed documentation of these initiatives, transcripts from meetings where this phenomenon has been discussed (e.g., global IGF Inter-Regional dialogues), and interviews with individuals engaged in facilitation of regional and national IGF initiatives. The goal of this exercise is to offer an empirically grounded framework for thinking about the emerging models of multistakeholder governance.

Intro

The phenomenal growth and widespread adoption of the Internet on a global scale, have posed new challenges to policymakers worldwide. At the core of this challenge lies the understanding that the multifaceted nature of Internet-related policy issues requires cooperation across traditional stakeholders. In fact, multiple histories of the Internet credit its success to non-hierarchical organizational arrangements that crossed traditional institutional boundaries. It is suggested that the modern Internet was possible due to the culture of inclusion, openness, and cooperation in its governance arrangements (e.g. MacLean 2004). In this context, the idea of multistakeholderism¹ emerged as one of the key operational principles and one of the main stones of contestation for Internet governance arrangements (Doria 2013; van Eeten & Mueller 2013).

The Internet Governance Forum (IGF) is often viewed as one of the prime examples of multistakeholderism in action. Established as a result of the second phase of the World Summit on Information Society (WSIS), the IGF has no formal decision-making authority. Instead, it is described in Paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda as a “new forum for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue” (Anon 2005b). As a result, some view it primarily as a red herring of Internet-related policymaking – not only does it take attention away from making binding decisions about controversial topics, even the non-binding discussions at the IGF avoid debating the hard questions (DeNardis 2010b). Others, however, view the IGF as an institutional innovation, which has legitimized the participation of non-state actors within the government-centric UN settings and thus forever changed the nature of Internet-related policy deliberation (Mathiason 2009). Regardless of the view about the value of IGF, it is one of the main scenes where forms of multistakeholder participation are being performed, reified, and refined – all of which make the IGF a particularly interesting space to study the emerging notion of multistakeholderism (Epstein 2013).

The emergence of regional and national IGF initiatives (regional and national IGFs) is the single most tangible outcome of the global IGF (Anon 2009). This series of meetings and discussions has witnessed significant growth and examining it will add to the repertoire of critical perspectives on the IGF and the multistakeholder model. This paper is one of the first attempts to carry out a systematic review of regional and national IGFs and how ideas of multistakeholderism are getting interpreted and enacted in those spaces.

The phenomenon of regional and national IGFs is relatively new. We aspire to capture both the breadth of the phenomenon and also its complexity and context-dependency. We start with a discussion of multistakeholderism and the IGF followed by a bird’s-eye view of the phenomenon of regional and national IGFs. We then focus on the case of the East African IGF, which offers an in-depth view on multistakeholder practices in one particular setting. We

¹ In this paper we use terms such as “multistakeholderism,” “multistakeholder participation,” “multistakeholder model” or “multistakeholder approach interchangeably. We are aware that there is an ongoing debate about the specific meaning of each term and other relevant combination of the stem “multistakeholder” (e.g., see Doria, 2013). For the purposes of this paper, however, we want to focus on the broad phenomenon without getting in the semantics of specific terminology.

conclude with a series of critical observations about the multiple faces of multistakeholderism in praxis.

Unpacking Multistakeholderism

There is no single unified definition or practice of multistakeholderism. In the area of Internet governance, the most commonly used formulation comes from the 2005 report of the UN Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG), which describes the multistakeholder approach as collaboration between “governments, the private sector and the civil society, in their respective roles” (Anon 2005a, p.4) around development and implementation of an array of Internet-related norms, principles, policies, and rules. On the one hand, such definition steered away from the idea of a single central authority over the Internet (Doria 2013; Kleinwächter 2008). As such, multistakeholderism became the default mode of operation for organizations engaged in Internet governance, even though at times it is performed only nominally or the term is abused to disguise lack of openness or transparency (Doria 2013; Epstein 2013). On the other hand, the WSIS definition offered a lot of room for interpretation (and thus for criticism) as to what multistakeholderism actually is and its impact (DeNardis & Raymond 2013; Doria 2013; Malcolm 2008). Such interpretations range in terms of stakeholder groups involved and their boundaries, in terms of the status and authority of various stakeholders, and in terms of perceived legitimacy of varying stakeholders’ modes of participation (DeNardis 2014; Malcolm 2008; Mueller 2010).

A survey conducted by the Internet Society (ISOC) in 2013 suggested that while there was broad acceptance of the idea of “multistakeholder governance” there was also a need to clarify the WGIG definition in terms of comprehensiveness and precision (in relation to “respective roles” of the stakeholders) (Anon 2013). The main criteria for assessing multistakeholder arrangements, as those were reflected in the survey, focused on efficiency, inclusiveness, and equality of participation. A more recent attempt to conceptualize multistakeholderism, based on a meta-analysis of 12 case-studies, focused on effectiveness, efficiency, and legitimacy of outcomes of produced in various multistakeholder arrangements, flows of information within these structures, and challenges of coordination between local and global activities. The report reached a similar conclusion – while multistakeholderism as an idea is broadly accepted in the Internet governance community, its interpretation and practices vary widely (Gasser et al. 2015)

With increased scholarly interest in Internet governance in the past decade (DeNardis 2010b), there have been multiple attempts to unpack the notion of multistakeholderism. One thread of scholarship deals with multistakeholderism as part of a broader political-economic analysis of Internet governance. Here, researchers are concerned with questions of power (Braman 2010; Mathiason 2009; Mueller 2010), the tension between government and non-government actors in a new information environment (Kleinwächter 2008; Mueller 2009; Mueller 2010), and macro-political processes and influences, such as imperial legacy or neoliberal ideology (Hill 2013; Pickard 2007). Another thread deals explicitly with the notion of multistakeholderism. While earlier studies focused mostly on describing the engagement of non-state actors, particularly civil society, in government-dominated decision-making (e.g. Malcolm 2008; Raboy

et al. 2010), recent studies attempt a more comprehensive look. Doria (2013), for example, unpacks the WGIG definition and discusses three “crucibles” of the multistakeholder process – Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), and the IGF – in terms of their openness, representativeness, legitimacy, and affordances for binding decision-making (pp.128-135). One of the main threads of her analysis is the multiplicity of interpretations, enactments, and visions of multistakeholderism. DeNardis and Raymond (2013) argue against viewing multistakeholderism “as a value in itself,” but instead as a variety of “types of administration [that] are optimal for promoting a balance of interoperability, innovation, free expression and operational stability in any particular functional and political context” (p.2). They offer a typology along two dimensions: the types of actors involved and the nature of authority relationships between the actors (i.e., hierarchy, polyarchy, and anarchy).

The global IGF has emerged as one of the prime examples of multistakeholderism in practice. Those supporting the IGF model praise the openness and inclusivity of non-state actors in the deliberative processes, but this view is not uniformly accepted by participants in the Internet governance space. Some see the sovereign state as the primary and sole decision-making authority; others view multistakeholder frameworks as not producing enough tangible results; all of which have exposed the IGF model to substantive criticism. Despite criticism and although the IGF has no decisionmaking authority, it continues to attract high-level participants, who meet to discuss existing and emerging Internet-related policy issues on at least nominally equal footing. Policy issues at IGF range from the management of critical Internet resources, to protection of human rights online, to the role of the Internet in socioeconomic development. Some have labeled the IGF as a “laboratory” of multistakeholderism (Kleinwächter 2010) and believe it holds an important promise for a new kind of institutional arrangement (de La Chapelle 2010; Mathiason 2009). Others, focusing solely on IGF outcomes, have criticized it for being just a “talk shop” that avoids deliberation of highly contested questions in the name of preserving a status quo under the guise of multistakeholderism (DeNardis 2010a; DeNardis 2014).

Mueller (2010) described the IGF as one of the places where “politics of participation” play out through the multistakeholder model (see pp.114-117). Our own earlier research suggests that IGF has a performative side when it comes to multistakeholderism (Epstein 2010). The idea of multiple stakeholders participating on equal footing is celebrated particularly through composition of plenary panels, which always involve representatives from the four groups of stakeholders typical for Internet governance debates: governments, civil society, private sector, and technical and academic community. As such, multistakeholderism is performed through nominal representation of stakeholder groups and politics of participation play out in selection of speakers to fill the speaking slots. When doing so, the IGF maintains a delicate balance between preserving the multistakeholder ethos and navigating the government-centric UN environment. This balancing is visible through the prominent roles given to the hosting government official at the global IGF and in the dynamics of the preparatory process. For example, members of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) are appointed by the Secretary General of the UN, but the meetings of the MAG are open to the public.

We claim that the IGF process does introduce an innovative disruption for the UN system and potentially beyond (Epstein 2013) – it is reflected in the legitimating authority of the language of multistakeholderism within the UN system (e.g., the International Telecommunication Union’s attempts to rebrand itself as a multistakeholder organization) and at least nominal changes in the working of formerly government-centric processes (e.g., the opening of the UN Conference on Trade and Development’s Working Group on Improvements to the IGF to participation of non-state actors). It remains to be seen whether these nominal changes will result in substantive shifts in the decision-making apparatus, but it already raises important questions about how the idea of multistakeholderism disseminates, gets adopted and interpreted outside of the UN settings. Regional and national IGFs offer an opportunity to look into these questions.

Regional and National IGFs

According to records available on the website of the global IGF, as of the summer of 2013 there were a total of at least 38 regional and 73 national IGF meetings since 2009 alone. Some of those initiatives have persisted over time; others seem to be one-time events. The IGF secretariat started formally keeping track of the regional and national initiatives in preparation for the 2010 meeting of the IGF (thus accounting for the state of affairs in 2009). In 2009, there were eight regional and 14 national initiatives. Since then, the number of regional IGFs first climbed up to 12 in 2011 and then stabilized at nine in 2012 (see Table 1); the number of national initiatives has steadily climbed until it reached 23 in 2011 and then dropped to only 16 in 2012 (see Table 2). In the last few years a series of youth-focused IGF initiatives has emerged, which probably could form a separate category.

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

In addition to the growing number of regional and national IGF initiatives, there is a trend towards “institutionalization” of the regional and national voices within the global IGF. Starting in 2010, there was some experimentation with weaving links to the regional and national initiatives into the program of the global IGF. Those ranged from workshops organized by or

² There is no clear definition of what constitutes an event that qualifies being included in the family of IGF events. So there are additional IGF-related or IGF-inspired initiatives that are not documented by the IGF secretariat at all. Some of those processes have been in existence for a while (e.g., Spanish IGF, Internet governance round table in Israel), others have not been consistent with submitting reports to the global IGF secretariat and thus are not consistently documented on the site. In other words, the phenomenon of regional and national IGFs is probably wider than what is captured on the global IGF website.

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

dedicated to particular initiatives to inter-regional dialogue sessions. Today, there is a functioning dedicated mailing list for facilitators of regional and national IGFs and there are expanding attempts to coordinate among the facilitators, as well as efforts at self evaluation. The IGF meeting in Bali, for example, had a “National and Regional IGF ‘Track’” on the day immediately preceding the opening of the main events, in addition to a number of Inter-regional dialogues dedicated to discussions among participants active in regional and national initiatives throughout the recent global IGF meetings.⁴

The Bird’s-Eye View: Multistakeholderism at Regional and National IGFs

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

It is important to remember that the reports, posted on the IGF website, were written for a particular purpose and as such draw a partial, potentially exaggeratedly positive, picture of the phenomenon. They tell little in terms of the nature of engagement in the regional and national IGF initiatives or about the practices underlying the organization of these events and their agenda setting. To complement this publicly available information, for this section we rely on in-depth interviews conducted with facilitators of four regional and four national IGFs. These interviews give a glimpse into the backstage processes leading to regional and national IGFs. In some aspects, these processes are very similar, but in others they are very distinct. Table 3 and Table 4 aggregate the key data available in the 2012 batch of reports from the regional and national IGFs.⁵ Following is our analysis of these data.

Format

Most of the documented events in 2012 followed one of the three nominal models. The most common model includes face-to-face, conference-style meetings, which typically ran for one day (with some meetings extending to as many as three) and include formal sessions with speakers representing diverse stakeholder groups (e.g., African IGF, EuroDIG, Uganda IGF).

⁴ See http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1352&Itemid=441 and <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/174-igf-2014/transcripts/2087-2014-09-03-inter-regional-dialogue-session-room-2> (as of February 5, 2015).

⁵ In 2013 all but one out of nine regional initiatives had reports available on the website of the global IGF (the report from Pacific IGF is missing); 10 out of the 16 national initiatives had reports available on the website of the global IGF (missing reports from Canada IGF, Kenya IGF, Malta IGF, Portugal IGF, Russia IGF, and IGF USA); as well as both of the Youth IGFs. Two of the national reports (Central Africa and Cote d'Ivoire) were in French and thus excluded from the current review. One report (German IGF) was in fact report from the German Youth IGF, which took place prior to the national IGF.

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

Our interviews suggest that the most common choice of the conference-style format is driven by treating the global IGF as a blueprint for what a multistakeholder discussion of Internet-related policy issues might look like. The choice of a smaller meeting format is typically driven by practical constraints, such as space, resources, and time limitations. Cultural characteristics also play a role in shaping how much interaction there is in the different sessions. Whereas in the global IGF the UN culture of diplomatic exchange typically dominates the deliberative practices, in regional and national IGFs, there is more room for local cultures to influence the flow of the conversation; some, for example can be more open to hosting diverse opinions in a public discussion, while others are more conservative in regard to having an open deliberation. During the global IGF meeting in Bali participants also suggested that cultural differences influence the preparatory processes of regional events. Here, they highlighted that the differences are as much procedural, as they are reflected in diverse substantive interests in Internet-related policies.

The Commonwealth IGF is the only initiative with a substantively different nominal model. Contrary to the first two models, this model is not organized around a single physical meeting. Instead it is run as an online platform for disseminating information about the global IGF process and Internet governance, and it also serves as a space for discussion, collaboration, and coordination among actors involved with the Commonwealth.⁶ Such a different format stems from a different role the facilitators of the Commonwealth IGF envision for their initiative. The main distinction seems to be viewing the goal of the IGF to be an ongoing deliberative process as opposed to a deliberative event (in the early days an IGF initiative in Spain, the organizers held regular meetings on a bimonthly basis).

Organization

One of the main notions that both regional and national IGF initiatives are constantly emphasizing is multistakeholderism as their core organizational principle. Similarly to the global IGF, they strive to demonstrate multistakeholderism in every aspect of the event, at least symbolically, including both decision-making and funding. Typically, launching a regional or national IGF requires a champion, who was exposed to the global IGF and gained support of institutional players. So, in practice, most initiatives have an organizational core with the champion's organization (typically a government or civil society body) and a conscious effort to perform multistakeholderism in every aspect of the endeavor.

Those initiatives that explained their decision-making processes in their reports emphasized the multistakeholder nature of the actors involved. Not all stakeholder groups are always represented, but there is a conscious attempt to have at least nominal representation for the classic Internet governance stakeholder groups (e.g., academia, civil society, government, private sector, technical community). In many cases the initiatives seem to originate from a government agency, but even then there is strong emphasis on engaging other stakeholders in

⁶ Canada IGF seems to move in the same direction by maintaining a website for continuous engagement with the public.

the shaping of the agenda. For example, the Arab IGF, which originated and received its legitimacy from within an intergovernmental regime, has modeled its decision-making processes after the global IGF, including having a MAG-like body that works through open consultations.

Information on funding of the IGF initiatives is scarce. Interviewees have estimated the cost of a typical one-time, annual public IGF event at around USD 100K to 300K, although no one provided an exact figure. On the IGF website, only a few initiatives (e.g., Asia Pacific IGF, Kenya IGF, East Africa IGF) explicitly list their donors. Most other reports talk in terms of partnership and support. Indeed, a significant portion of the cost is covered through in-kind donations, but hosting a large public event is a costly endeavor. Where partners are listed most of them seem to come from the government sector, with fewer coming from the private sector or from traditional Internet organizations such as ISOC. Overall, funding appears as the most significant barrier to organizing regional and national IGFs, particularly in their current dominant format of a large face-to-face event. This sentiment was echoed numerous times during the 2013 and 2014 inter-regional dialogues. During the 2014 inter-regional dialogue, the Secretariat of the global IGF announced that a number of associations, such as Friends of the IGF, were in the works, and those associations will be vehicles for channeling donations-based funding to regional and national IGFs. Moving on, it will be important to identify or develop sustainable funding models to support distributed multistakeholder policy deliberation at both the regional and the national levels.

Participation

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

With regards to panel composition, in most cases, the organizers report representation of all main stakeholder groups typically mentioned in relation to multistakeholderism in Internet governance. Since the level of detail of reports varies substantially, there is no comprehensive picture available. With that, one may notice that in some cases the academic community is under-represented in both regional and national IGF initiatives. During inter-regional dialogues at the global IGF in Bali and Istanbul, different facilitators highlighted lack of participation from governments, the private sector or the civil society as a major challenge on this front. In many cases this difficulty tends to reflect an external reality, such as actual lack of strong civil society in a particular country or a region. A more detailed analysis of the lists of speakers as well as additional interviews with the organizers are required in order to draw a more precise picture of the multistakeholder model as it is enacted through the composition of the panels at regional and national IGFs.

In reports that provide information about speakers, one can see names of individuals active in the global IGF, being also active in regional and national events. In other words, the nucleus of idea entrepreneurs from the global IGF is also active in, and in some cases leading, the regional

and national initiatives.⁷ At the same time, it is clear that both regional and national events bring new individuals into the Internet governance discussion. Here, geography matters and in Bali a number of facilitators from larger countries (e.g., Australia) spoke about the difficulty of broadening the engagement due to geographical constraints. This dynamic is similar to the dynamic observed in the global IGF, where location of the event influences the mix of participants, giving an advantage to local participants and amplifying the voice of local activist groups in a country where the IGF is hosted. Verbal accounts from the organizers support an observation that there is limited overlap in speakers at the global, regional and national events. The question remains whether those speakers bring in new perspectives.

Participation of the audience is rarely documented. A few IGFs report aggregate attendance statistics, but more information about the scope, and more so the nature, of audience participation is lacking. There is also limited information about efforts to make the IGFs accessible in terms of (1) accessibility to people with disabilities, (2) novice participants, and (3) remote participants. For example, EuroDIG was one of the early adopters of remote participation practices as well as closed captioning. IGF USA, on the other hand, had an ongoing relationship with the Imagining the Internet Project at Elon University whereby a team of journalism college students would cover the national IGF event and communicate it to the public.⁸

Agenda

Thematically, some of the initiatives, particularly the younger ones seem to mirror the general agenda of the global IGF, adopting the same structure and even titles for the sessions. In fact, most available agendas suggest a variation of the themes discussed at the global IGF.⁹ One common strategy is discussing an IGF theme in the context of a particular country or region. The local realities are reflected in agendas not only through contextualizing of global Internet-related policy issues, but also in the salience of particular themes or issue framing. For example, there is more discussion of the link between Internet governance and development in developing economies, whereas there is more discussion of human rights and civil liberties in developed economies. There is no well-established single practice for determining the agenda. In the larger events, the organizers try utilize a formal proposal solicitation process, similar to the one practiced at the global IGF. In the smaller events, the consultations are often less formal.

The unique topics discussed at the regional or national IGFs are particularly interesting as tracing those over time may teach us about the dynamics of policy agenda setting between the global and the more local levels. Thus, for example, a number of the African regional IGFs

⁷ For a more thorough discussion of the IGF nucleus see Epstein (2011).

⁸ For example, see their coverage of IGF USA 2012 at: http://www.elon.edu/e-web/predictions/igf_usa/2012/default.xhtml

⁹ Typically, a global IGF has five fixed themes (Access and Diversity; Security, Openness and Privacy; Managing Critical Internet Resources; Emerging Issues; and Taking Stock and the Way Forward) and one theme that is changing from year to year (e.g., Social Networks). Recently, the theme of Internet Governance for Development (IG4D) got established as another more or less permanent theme on the agenda of the global IGF.

explicitly focused on discussing the International Telecommunication Regulations (ITRs), in preparation for the World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT); the Arab IGF focused on discussing youth in the online world in light of the Arab Spring; and EuroDIG focused on the changing nature of European democracy and social inclusivity. In national IGFs more emphasis is placed on capacity building, which is manifested through more introductory sessions that explain Internet governance and its history. In 2014, NetMundial was perhaps the single most influential event in terms of setting the agenda and the practices of regional and national IGFs. A more detailed analysis of the substance of the discussions, beyond the titles and descriptions of the sessions is needed. A detailed analysis will lead to a clearer picture of not only which topics are relevant to those geo-political settings, but also how participants in regional and national IGFs frame the policy issues at hand.

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

Connection to the global IGF

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

Similarly, interviewees have also emphasized the influence of the global IGF in terms of agenda setting and offering models of multistakeholder cooperation. At the very least it offers a blueprint for acceptable multistakeholder practices. At the most, it can be used as a definitive guide. In some ways, regional and national IGFs can be viewed as part of an ongoing global deliberation of Internet governance with the global meetings serving as milestones. The growing institutionalization of reporting and collaboration mechanisms for regional and national IGFs within the global event adds a framework that provides the regional and national

initiatives with legitimacy and implies a hierarchical relationship between regional and national IGFs and the global event.

A Deeper Look: The Case of the East African IGF

The conceptual understanding of multistakeholderism and its manifestation in practice are responsive to differing contexts. This is expressed through the organizational structures and procedures of the events, funding mechanisms, agendas and formats, the kind of participation attracted and enabled, as well as the potential influence on national, regional, or global Internet governance debates. The following section offers insight into the structure and performance of a regional IGF, the East African Internet Governance Forum (EAIGF), by exploring the multistakeholder processes exhibited in practice. Data were collected from semi-structured in-depth interviews with key stakeholders, observations of face-to-face forum sessions during the 2012 EAIGF, and qualitative document analysis.

Format of the EAIGF

The EAIGF was the first regional IGF established globally in 2008. The EAIGF is composed of the five member countries of the East African Community (EAC): Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda. Formally, the EAIGF strives to follow the Tunis Agenda guidelines that IGF processes should be “multilateral, multistakeholder, democratic and transparent” (Anon, 2005b, p. 11). Outlined in its guidelines, the overarching objectives of the EAIGF are to (Anon 2008, p.1):

1. Create awareness and build policy and technical capacity in order to enable meaningful participation in global Internet governance and ICT policy processes;
2. Institute a consensus building process and develop a common understanding among East African Internet stakeholders on the nature and character of Internet governance; and
3. Provide a forum that engages industry, government, parliament, media, academia and civil society in debate on Internet governance issues.

Similarly to the global IGF, performative multistakeholderism can be observed at the EAIGF where formal sessions sought to include representatives from stakeholder groups traditionally represented in the Internet governance discussions. The 2012 EAIGF included formal sessions held over a two-day face-to-face conference-style forum. The forum followed UN-style formality where the order, time allocation for speakers, and question and answer sessions were strictly enforced. Interviews suggested that stakeholders viewed the rigid structure of the forum as a necessary formal preparatory step in defining the policy positions the region would present at the global IGF meeting.

Organization of the EAIGF

Kenyan civil society organizations have organized every EAIGF since its initiation. Their role includes identifying participants and presenters, venues, and funding mechanisms. Even though the face-to-face meeting is supposed to transition between the five EAC member countries, three out of the five EAIGF meetings have been held in Kenya.

According to EAIGF participants, Kenya's consistent role as facilitator of the EAIGF is due to its position as a regional economic leader, its strong telecommunications sector and its leadership in ICT policy reform. While the EAIGF employs performative multistakeholderism, where stakeholders from all EAC member countries and relevant stakeholder groups are encouraged to participate, there is greater participation by Kenyan civil society stakeholders. This may be due to the fact that the face-to-face forum has been held more frequently in Kenya and organized by Kenyan civil society stakeholders. Thus, the voices of the other EAC member countries may not be as well represented in EAIGF processes.

Civil society stakeholders who lead the EAIGF maintain close ties to government and the global IGF. During interviews, numerous government stakeholders commended the role of civil society as the organizational nucleus of the EAIGF. This arrangement is believed to ensure that the EAIGF forms a close collaboration between civil society and government in Internet governance policymaking, without the threat of government stakeholders overtaking the forum for their interests. A member of a Kenyan civil society organization explained that the impact of the EAIGF would be minimal without government involvement. "Policy does not move without government. Without their presence in the forum, it is just a nice conversation." Judging by comments made during the global IGF in Bali, this finding is in contrast to other local IGFs where government involvement is lacking.

The EAIGF adheres to the global IGF model where stakeholders from academia, civil society, government, and industry meet during a face-to-face meeting for a non-binding deliberation of Internet-related policy issues. However, participants differ in their views of the intended and actual outcomes of the EAIGF. While some believe the forum directly affects policy formation due to the involvement of members of ICT-related ministries and telecommunications regulatory agencies, others believe that the EAIGF must build greater capacity to impact actual policy formation within the region. While some believe that the non-binding structure enables open discussions and lesson drawing between countries, others express concern that the sustainability of the EAIGF is vulnerable due to its lack of authority in policy development and inconsistent funding.

Participation in the EAIGF

Even though the EAIGF seeks to promote stakeholder inclusivity, the majority of participants and formal presenters were from Kenyan civil society organizations and government agencies. Civil society stakeholders emphasized that their key intention for participating in the EAIGF is to engage directly with government representatives to better ensure their perspectives influence policy formation. A member of a Ugandan civil society organization commented, "Usually civil society stakeholders come to listen to and speak with government because this is the only forum where you get to have different government officials from different countries come together to discuss Internet governance policy issues." There were few academic stakeholders and private sector stakeholders were grossly underrepresented, but even then participants believed the forum was achieving its goal of multistakeholderism. Interviews suggest that the forum has been able to maintain its multistakeholder approach due to the efforts of civil society stakeholders to bring together multiple stakeholders. A member of the Uganda

Communications Commission explained that “because the forums are organized by civil society, everybody has equal participation” and a member of the Uganda Ministry of Information and Communication Technology explained that because of the multistakeholder nature of the EAIGF and national IGFs, “We are seeing again and again a close relationship emerge between civil society and government as far as Internet governance issues are concerned.”

Agenda of the EAIGF

We used the 2012 EAIGF program agenda and observations conducted during the 2012 EAIGF to identify which stakeholder groups and EAC member countries gave a formal presentation. Overwhelmingly, representatives from civil society organizations gave the majority of the presentations followed by representatives from national telecommunications regulatory agencies. Additionally, Kenyans gave more than half of the presentations. Table 5 provides a breakdown of the stakeholder groups and EAC member countries that gave a formal presentation at the 2012 EAIGF.

The goals of the EAIGF focused on identifying national best practices and defining the regional perspective for issues addressed at the global IGF. Regional issues discussed at the 2012 EAIGF included: assignment of top-level domain names and establishment of the .africa domain for the continent; e-government; use of social media to promote democratic processes; intermediary liability in the spread of illegal content; and establishment of a cyber law framework for the region. The EAIGF set aside the second day of the forum to discuss the East African position on the revisions to the International Telecommunications Regulations (ITRs), which were to be discussed during a workshop at the 2012 global IGF in preparation for WCIT.

Connections between EAIGF and Global IGF

While the EAIGF aligns with the global IGF in terms of structure and overarching goals, interviews revealed that participants believe it is necessary to create a more formal structure for the EAIGF to deter it from becoming institutionalized as a “talk shop” and to promote the EAIGF’s influence on developing open and cooperative policymaking in the region. One participant noted that “[The EAIGF needs to] come out of this IGF talk show mode into something a little bit more concrete” and that the EAIGF “need[s] to have some kind of framework or some kind of system to continually move some of the things talked about in the EAIGF into the real world.” Criticism of the lack of a true multistakeholder process (i.e., the lack of private sector and academic stakeholders) and the inability of the regional IGF to directly influence policy formation aligns with criticism also found at the global IGF level (e.g., DeNardis 2010a; DeNardis 2014).

While participants commended the EAIGF for promoting “lesson-drawing” and “capacity-building” through multistakeholder discussions, the forum was criticized for not creating “concrete” outcomes. EAIGF stakeholders explicitly differentiated the goals of the EAIGF from the goals of the global IGF model—the EAIGF *should* lead directly to policy formation *not* discourse about potential policy solutions.

Conclusions

The emerging pattern of regional and national IGFs is that of a network with a group of idea entrepreneurs acting as links between the various geo-politically distinct fora for Internet-related policy deliberation. In many ways, our analysis illustrates a common argument that multistakeholderism comes in numerous shapes and flavors reflected in the format, organization, and agenda of the regional and national IGFs. Given the state of conceptual development of multistakeholderism and with currently available data, it is hard to offer a definitive typology of regional and national events. Our current analysis, however, raises a series of important questions for future research. First, it highlights the tension between performative and substantive multistakeholderism. Second, our analysis highlights a number of practical constraints that shape the multistakeholder engagement. Third, adding to the ongoing discussions, it further problematizes the conceptualization of the impact of IGF as a multistakeholder endeavor. Finally, our analysis identifies areas for additional data collection, which will enable a more systematic study of multistakeholderism within the IGF ecosystem.

Performative vs. substantive multistakeholderism

In the current state of affairs, multistakeholderism appears to be an ideal, which is interpreted in light of the practices of the global IGF and under the constraints of each particular initiative. Whereas the global IGF is held in many cases as a blueprint for multistakeholder deliberation of Internet-related policy, enactment of this model in local settings depends on available resources. Thus, a serious question arises about the impacts of performative vs. substantive multistakeholderism.

Currently, the main way to demonstrate multistakeholder performance is to include a mix of speakers or participants, who are associated with the traditional stakeholder groups. On the one hand, such approach does not assure that the ideas discussed by those participants in fact represent the full spectrum of ideas or concerns held by stakeholders in that region or that these discussions influence inclusion of multistakeholder viewpoints in policy formation. There is also an inherent tension between participation in personal capacity and assertions of representation of stakeholder groups, even if only implied. On the other hand, performing multistakeholderism emerges as a legitimizing function within the IGF; in some cases, multistakeholderism appears to be a goal in itself. As such, even performative forms of multistakeholderism offer a departure from the traditional forms of engagement in policy deliberation as a prerogative of the state, which is particularly interesting in authoritarian societies with weak civic institutions.

Observing current practices suggests that the core organization leading each initiative has an immense effect on the practices of organizing regional and national initiatives. So, in places where engagement of non-state actors in policy deliberation is by default limited, IGF initiatives may experience limited substantive multistakeholder engagement, even when the organizers formally aspire to have a multistakeholder engagement. While counting nominal affiliations with stakeholder groups is a reasonable and pragmatic approach, adding additional metrics (e.g., levels of participation, points of view expressed, engagement in deliberation and consensus-building between stakeholder groups, etc.) should improve our understanding of substantive multistakeholderism and our ability to evaluate it.

Contextualizing multistakeholderism

The tension between performative and substantive multistakeholderism is fed by political, cultural, and economic realities within which IGFs must operate. Both organizers and participants in these initiatives face challenges of barriers to entry, funding, and path dependency in terms of practices and conceptualization of multistakeholder engagement.

Meaningful engagement in any policy deliberation requires familiarity with both the decisionmaking process and the subject matter being discussed. Broadening meaningful multistakeholder participation in Internet governance is related to awareness of Internet-related policy issues, accessibility of the substance of Internet governance debates, and value propositions for those who consider engagement. First, engaging with substantive Internet governance topics requires a steep learning curve, which creates a barrier to entry for newcomers. Second, discussions at the global IGF tend to be on the meta-level, which is not always easily translated into regional—and even more so national contexts. This barrier makes it harder for local civil society activists or private sector actors to see the value of their participation. Finally, actors who seek quick and tangible outcomes, fail to see the value proposition of a non-binding deliberative process.

In addition to barriers identified above, lack of sustainable funding models for the regional and national IGFs was the single most commonly mentioned barrier during IGF 2013, which played into establishment of contribution-based funding mechanisms such as the Friends of the IGF announced in 2014. On the one hand, multistakeholderism implies a degree of independence of actors and policy deliberation spaces. On the other hand, carrying out an IGF initiative in practice, even in the most modest constellation, requires an organizational core. One of the big questions is how to maintain balance that allows for relative independence of actors engaged in policy deliberation, while enabling sustainable funding and continuous organizational and political support. Funding models have an important symbolic value for the multistakeholder model, even though what counts as a sustainable and balanced funding model may vary in different parts of the world.

Finally, similarly to the global IGF, the phenomenon of regional and national IGFs is also dealing with a strong path dependency. The fact that many of the regional and national initiatives derive both their mode of operation and their agenda from the global event may make it harder to make the multistakeholder model locally-relevant. For example, arranging the event around a large physical meeting limits broad participation due to the need to travel, particularly in larger countries. In addition, a single annual event is limited in its ability to catch up with substantive policy challenges, which evolve and change rapidly in the field of Internet governance. Experimenting with other formats of physical meetings such as numerous small, spatially dispersed meet-ups could be promising as well as experimenting with more extensive use of online tools (e.g., Commonwealth IGF and Canada IGF). In addition to potentially broadening participation, using online tools may help turn regional and national IGFs into ongoing deliberative processes as opposed to singular events.

Another path-dependency tension arises between semi-hierarchical approaches apparent in some of the regional IGFs and the independent nature of many of the national initiatives. Yes, there is a need and a call for cross-fertilization between the national and the regional

initiatives; and it should be expected that regional and national policy issues will be interrelated. At the same time, a regional discussion is not an aggregation of local discussions, just like the global IGF is not an aggregation of regional debates. While some issues are indeed interrelated, many of these initiatives view themselves as independent and as tackling a set of unique problems.

Re-conceptualizing the impact of the IGF approach

The value proposition of non-binding policy deliberations remains an important unanswered question surrounding the global IGF and its regional and national offsprings. In some ways, the phenomena of regional and national IGFs is a manifestation of some of the stated goals of the forum, such as capacity building and knowledge exchange across stakeholder boundaries. The strong links between the regional and national IGF initiatives and the global IGF mean there is potential for greater cross-fertilization of policy agendas. On the one hand, policy issues emerging from wide and rapid adoption of the Internet are no longer bound to particular geographies. On the other hand, Internet-related policy issues can no longer be worked out in silos and the network of policy deliberation spaces that spawned off of the global IGF is reflective of that.

One way to view the range of models for Internet policy-related deliberation or decision-making is on a continuum between diplomacy and policymaking. Some policy deliberations, such as WSIS, can be better placed at the diplomacy edge of the continuum. Other policy deliberations, such as rulemaking, can better be placed at the policymaking edge of the continuum. This mapping also matches the geographical scope of the policy deliberation – the broader that scope the more diplomatic the discussion becomes, while its concrete policy outcomes get more ambiguous and less specific. In other words, it may be productive to view regional and national initiatives as helping to bridge the diplomatic exercise of global IGF and the practical local regulatory activities. For example, some regional IGF stakeholders believe that the regional IGF helped shape specific regional policies.

Building blocks for future research

This study highlights the need to collect richer data about the growing IGF phenomenon. Such data will not only allow assessing the scope of adoption of the multistakeholder approach to Internet governance and allow eventual systematic comparison across initiatives; it will also assist those trying to launch a multistakeholder initiative on Internet-related policy. Promoting better documentation of the regional and national efforts should be a priority in order to develop best practices that can be used to better ensure successful implementation of multistakeholderism in practice.

Acknowledgements

[To be added after review]

Acronyms

EACO - East African Communications Organization
EAIGF – East African Internet Governance Forum
EuroDIG – European Dialogue on Internet Governance
MAG – Multistakeholder Advisory Group
IGF – Internet Governance Forum
ICANN – Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
ISOC – Internet Society
ITRs – International Telecommunication Regulations
WCIT - World Conference on International Telecommunications
WGIG – Working Group on Internet Governance
WSIS – World Summit on Information Society

Bibliography

- Anon, 2013. *Internet Society questionnaire on multistakeholder governance*, Internet Society. Available at: <http://www.internetsociety.org/sites/default/files/bp-MSreport-20131219-en.pdf>. Anon, 2009. *Internet Governance Forum: Identifying impact*, Msida, Malta: Diplo Foundation. Available at: <http://www.diplomacy.edu/ig/impact/>.
- Anon, 2008. *EAC Legal Framework for Cyberlaws*. East African Internet Governance Forum. Available at: http://www.eac.int/infrastructure/index.php?option=com_docman&Itemid=144
- Anon, 2005a. *Report of the working group on Internet Governance*, Château de Bossey: Working Group on Internet Governance. Available at: <http://www.wgig.org/docs/WGIGREPORT.pdf> [Accessed September 28, 2008].
- Anon, 2005b. *Tunis agenda for the information society*, Tunis: The World Summit on Information Society. Available at: http://www.itu.int/wsis/documents/doc_multi.asp?lang=en&id=2266|2267 [Accessed February 16, 2007].
- Braman, S., 2010. The interpenetration of technical and legal decision-making for the Internet. *Information, Communication & Society*, 13(3), pp.309–324.
- DeNardis, L., 2010a. The emerging field of internet governance. Available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1678343 [Accessed March 2, 2011].
- DeNardis, L., 2014. *The global war for internet governance*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- DeNardis, L., 2010b. The privatization of internet governance. In Fifth Annual GigaNet Symposium. Vilnius, Lithuania.
- DeNardis, L. & Raymond, M., 2013. Thinking clearly about multistakeholder internet governance. In Eighth Annual GigaNet Symposium. Bali, Indonesia.
- Doria, A., 2013. Use [and abuse] of multistakeholderism in the internet. In R. Radu, J.-M. Chenou, & R. H. Weber, eds. *The evolution of global internet governance: Principles and policies in the making*. New York, NY: Springer, pp. 115–140. Available at: <http://www.springer.com/law/international/book/978-3-642-45298-7> [Accessed June 3, 2014].
- Van Eeten, M. & Mueller, M., 2013. Where is the governance in Internet governance? *New Media & Society*, 15(5), pp.720–736.

- Epstein, D., 2010. Constructing the Information Society: The binding nature of non-binding debates about Internet Governance. In Telecommunication Policy Research Conference. Arlington, VA. Available at: http://www.tprcweb.com/images/stories/2010%20papers/epstein_tprc2010.pdf.
- Epstein, D., 2011. Manufacturing Internet policy language: The inner workings of the discourse construction at the Internet Governance Forum. In Telecommunication Policy Research Conference. Arlington, VA. Available at: http://www.tprcweb.com/images/stories/2010%20papers/epstein_tprc2010.pdf.
- Epstein, D., 2013. The making of institutions of information governance: The case of the Internet Governance Forum. *Journal of Information Technology*, 28(2), pp.137–149.
- Gasser, U., Budish, R. & West, S.M., 2015. *Multistakeholder as governance groups: Observations from case studies*, Cambridge, MA: Berkman Center for Internet and Society. Available at: <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2549270> [Accessed February 8, 2015].
- Hill, R., 2013. Internet governance: The last gasp of colonialism, or imperialism by other means? In R. Radu, J.-M. Chenou, & R. H. Weber, eds. *The evolution of global internet governance: Principles and policies in the making*. New York, NY: Springer, pp. 79–94. Available at: <http://www.springer.com/law/international/book/978-3-642-45298-7> [Accessed June 3, 2014].
- Kleinwächter, W., 2010. Multistakeholderism and the IGF: Laboratory, clearinghouse, watchdog. In W. J. Drake, ed. *Internet governance: Creating opportunities for all*. New York, NY: United Nations, pp. 76–91.
- Kleinwächter, W., 2008. Multistakeholderism, civil society, and global diplomacy: The case of the World Summit on the Information Society. In W. J. Drake & E. J. Wilson, eds. *Governing global electronic networks*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp. 535–582.
- De La Chapelle, B., 2010. Towards an internet governance network: Why the format of the IGF is one of its major outcomes. In W. J. Drake, ed. *Internet governance: Creating opportunities for all*. New York, NY: United Nations, pp. 92–106.
- MacLean, D. ed., 2004. *Internet Governance: A grand collaboration*, New York, NY: United Nations.
- Malcolm, J., 2008. *Multi-stakeholder governance and the Internet Governance Forum*, Perth, Australia: Terminus Press.
- Mathiason, J., 2009. *Internet Governance: The new frontier of global institutions*, New York, NY: Routledge.

- Mueller, M.L., 2009. Internet content regulation and the limits of sovereignty. *World Politics Review*. Available at: <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articlePrint.aspx?ID=4240> [Accessed September 18, 2009].
- Mueller, M.L., 2010. *Networks and states: The global politics of internet governance*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pickard, V., 2007. Neoliberal visions and revisions in global communications policy from NWICO to WSIS. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 31(2), pp.118–139.
- Raboy, M., Landry, N. & Shtern, J., 2010. *Digital solidarities, communication policy and multi-stakeholder global governance*, New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing. Available at: <http://www.peterlang.com/index.cfm?event=cmp.ccc.seitenstruktur.detailseiten&seite=ntyp=produkt&pk=54123&cid=537> [Accessed November 1, 2012].

Tables

Table 1: Regional IGF Initiatives*

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

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

Table 2: National IGF Initiatives*

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

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

Table 3: 2012 Regional IGFs – Key Factors

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

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

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

| Event | Planning process | Organizing actors | Speakers | Support | Main themes |
|---|------------------|--|--|--|--|
| East Africa IGF (Nairobi, Kenya; July 17-18) | N/A | Kenya ICT Action Network (KICTANet) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government • Civil society • Private sector • Technical community | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National IGF reports; • Intermediary liability; • ICANN; • Open data/Open government; • Cybercrime; • Youth and IGF; • Social media and democracy in East Africa; • WCIT and ITRs; • Stakeholder perspectives; • Public sector perspectives; |
| EuroDIG (Stockholm, Sweden; June 14-15) | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council of Europe • Federal Office of Communications, Switzerland | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government • IGOs • Civil society • Private sector • Academia • Technical community | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swedish Post and Telecom Authority • European Broadcasting Union • European Youth Forum • Swedish Internet Infrastructure Foundation (.se) • Other organizations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who sets the rules for the Internet? • An inclusive society – Europe in the digital age? • Intellectual property rights • Online privacy • Business innovation, future technologies and services • European democracy in change • Cyber-crime and cyber security • Child protection and child empowerment; • Digital citizenship • Internet governance principles, policies, and practices • Data retention, inclusion • Changes in media ecosystem • Territoriality, jurisdiction and internet related laws • Net neutrality |

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

Table 4: 2012 National IGFs – Key Factors*

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

| Event | Planning process | Organizing actors | Speakers | Support | Main themes |
|---|----------------------------------|---|----------|---------|--|
| IGF Japan ¹⁰ (Tokyo, July 18-20) | A series of preparatory meetings | N/A | N/A | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internet for Disaster Relief and Restoration; • The Impact of New gTLD; • Global Cloud Computing and its Challenges; • Internet Governance for Development; • The Evolving Internet Ecosystem; • Critical Internet Resources: IPv4/IPv6; • Protection of Children from Cybercrimes on the Internet; • Civil Society in Internet Governance/ Policymaking; |
| Nigerian IGF (Abuja, Sep.25) | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nigerian Communications Commission (NCC) • National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA) • Nigeria Internet Registration Association (NIRA) • Federal Ministry of Communication Technology. | N/A | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access and Diversity • Security, Openness and Privacy • Managing Critical Internet Resources • Internet Governance for Development (IG4D) • Emerging Issues and Taking Stock and the Way Forward |

¹⁰ Was co-located with the Asia Pacific IGF.

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

| Event | Planning process | Organizing actors | Speakers | Support | Main themes |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Ukrainian IGF (Sep 28) | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ukrainian Internet association • Ukrainian League of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs • Association of Information Technology Enterprises of Ukraine • Telecommunication chamber of Ukraine • Ukrainian Association of IT professionals • Independent Association of Broadcasters • INO “European Media Platform” • Council of Europe • Communication and Informatization Advisory Committee at the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine • State Agency for Science, Innovation and Informatization • more | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Adamant” company • “First National” • Ukr.net • “The Day” newspaper • “Era television company” • “First Business Channel” • Radio-ERA FM” • Publishing house “SoftPress” • Newspaper “DK-Zvjazok” • “Telecom Communication and Networks” magazine • Agency of Communication and Informational Technologies “Press-Kit” • “Wireless Ukraine” magazine, Internet.UA • IT Expert, • InfoStream” • Delo” newspaper • Golos.UA • more | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local legislation with regards to consumer electronics, access to communication, and state oversight • Regulatory reform • Multistakeholderism |
| UK IGF (London, Mar 22) | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nominet • UK Department for Culture, Media & Sport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government • Civil society • Private sector • Technical community | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identity governance on the internet • Content creation in a changing world • Cyber security |

*Based primarily on reports submitted by regional and national initiatives at: <http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/component/content/article/114-preparatory-process/1281-igf-initiatives-2012>

Table 5: Breakdown of the 34 Presentations at the 2012 East Africa Internet Governance Forum by Country and Stakeholder Group.

| | | Stakeholder Group | | | | | TOTAL |
|---------|----------|-------------------|---------------|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------|
| | | Academia | Civil Society | ICT-related Ministries | Private Sector | Regulatory Agency | |
| Country | Burundi | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 2 |
| | Kenya | - | 9 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 19 |
| | Rwanda | - | 3 | - | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| | Tanzania | - | 2 | - | 1 | - | 3 |
| | Uganda | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 3 |
| TOTAL | | 1 | 16 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 34 |