ict Development Associates *ltd*

145 Lower Camden
Chislehurst
Kent BR7 5JD
United Kingdom

MAPPING INTERNET PUBLIC POLICY:

Notes on slide presentation to APC symposium on *Networking Networks in Internet Public Policy*

David Souter

July 2010

Telephone: +44 (0)208 467 1148 or +44 (0)7764 819974
Fax: +44 (0)208 249 0891
Email: david.souter@runbox.com
Company registration no. 4603511

MAPPING INTERNET PUBLIC POLICY: Notes on slide presentation to APC symposium on *Networking Networks in Internet Public Policy*

David Souter – July 2010

The following pages annotate the presentation on *Mapping internet public policy* which was presented at the APC-led symposium on *Networking Networks in Internet Public Policy*, held at Eremo, Italy in July 2010.

References are to slide numbers in this presentation.

1. The purpose of the presentation is to put forward approaches to mapping the internet public policy space, the decision-making entities and actors participating in it. These are intended to assist civil society organisations (and, potentially, other actors) in thinking through their objectives, areas of focus and actual and potential network partners. The maps presented are intended to be illustrative rather than comprehensive, though an attempt has been made to include the major issues and institutions that affect civil society activity in the internet public policy space.

2. This slide outlines the structure for the presentation.

3. The first section describes some existing mapping frameworks that have been used within the internet public policy space. Many such frameworks have been developed by different organisations, and each has value within its own context – particularly the needs of the organisation that developed it, and the aspect(s) of internet public policy with which it is concerned.

4. Example 1 is from the Diplo Foundation's widely read book on *Internet Governance – Issues, Actors and Divides*. It allocates internet public policy issues into five thematic "baskets", one of which is primarily internal to the internet (infrastructure and standardisation) while the remainder reach to varying degrees into other areas of public policy.

5. Example 2 is from the article 'Herding Schrödinger's Cats', written by Don MacLean for the Working Group on Internet Governance in 2004, which draws on a framework in the *Louder Voices* report (Don MacLean, David Souter *et al.* for G8 DOT Force, 2002). This distributes internet issues, and by implication decision-making institutions, according to two criteria – the scope of the decisions involved (horizontal axis) and the type of governance instrument applied (vertical axis).

6. Example 3 is one of many layer models of the internet, this one taken from work by Global Partners for the Ford Foundation's Freedom of Expression Project. It seeks to relate the technical structure of the internet (boxes) to aspects of governance (ellipses), and to users and uses, in a reconceptualisation of the communications environment (called here "the networked communications environment").

7. Example 4 is the classification of internet governance issues that was agreed by the Working Group on Internet Governance, which reported between the two phases of WSIS in 2004. The vertically-separated categories in this image relate to different types of issue, but also reflect a continuum between issues where decisions are primarily located within the internet (at the top) and those where decisions are primarily located outside it (at the bottom) – the distinction between what are sometimes called "narrow" and "broad" internet governance.

8. Example 5 illustrates the way in which the Internet Governance Forum has addressed internet public policy issues. It initially focused on the four issues represented by horizontal bars in the centre of the diagram and the two cross-cutting themes represented by vertical columns over them. It has since added "critical internet resources" as an important theme, and has also looked at technical issues, emerging issues and governance arrangements (not least itself).

9. These are merely examples of the many different mapping approaches which already exist. The purpose of this particular presentation is to look at how the internet public policy space might be mapped for the purposes of civil society organisations wishing to address issues of particular concern to them, both on their own and in partnership with other civil society organisations and other stakeholder communities.

10. In particular, the presentation is concerned with three overlapping dimensions for mapping the internet space – issues, decision-making institutions/fora, and actors/stakeholders. Any organisation which seeks to influence decisions in the internet public policy space needs to understand these three dimensions and itself in relation to them.

    This slide also illustrates a colour coding for different types of activity/actor which is used in some, but not all, of the subsequent slides.

11. The internet public policy space is multi-dimensional, and so difficult to map in two dimensions. Many different criteria can be chosen for distributing issues and institutions across a spectrum or continuum within the policy space. This slide illustrates three of these ways in which the policymaking space, issues and actors can be distributed, which are explored further in the three following slides. These might be thought of as slices through a three-dimensional object (cube or sphere).

12. The first of these slices across internet public policy concerns the continuum between "narrow"/technical issues – whose governance lies largely within internet-specific entities – and "broad"/public policy issues – whose governance lies primarily with entities outside the internet community. A number of internet entities are mapped across this continuum on this slide, using the colour coding illustrated in slide 10.

13. The second illustrative slice across internet public policy concerns the continuum between global and national spheres of decision-making (horizontal axis), which are juxtaposed with decision-making scope (vertical axis, to some extent related to the "narrow"/"broad" distinction in slide 12). Again, a number of internet decision-entities are identified against particular spaces in this geographic distribution, using the appropriate colour coding.

14. The third illustrative slice across internet public policy concerns the continuum between different types of governance instrument. As in the *Louder Voices /* Schrödinger's Cats model described in slide 5, this distributes example internet governance entities according to the scope of their activity (horizontal axis) and the type/strength of governance instruments applied (vertical axis), the latter ranging from strict legal requirements through standards to market governance and policy coordination.

15. These initial maps have been intended to show the complexity of internet public policy, and to emphasise that there are many different ways in which the internet public policy space can be described. The next sections of the presentation are concerned with more detailed mapping instruments, concerned firstly with internet issues, and secondly with internet entities and actors/stakeholders. Both of these mapping approaches are built up through a series of sequential slides.

16. The first series, which uses a mind-mapping approach, is concerned with internet issues. The mapping of issues is complex and the resulting maps can be daunting. It is often best to build these up gradually, moving from a basic division of issues to a more complex picture in a series of stages. This initial slide distributes internet issues into a number of broad categories. Some of these, those emerging from the left of the central ellipse within the diagram, are primarily technical or concerned with the working of the internet itself. Others, those emerging from the right of the ellipse, are primarily concerned with the impact that the internet has on aspects of society, economy, politics and culture. There are, of course, points of contact across as well as within these eleven broad categories of internet issues.

17. The next few slides look at particular categories within this overall distribution. In each case, the category is subdivided into a number of issues, identified in transparent boxes. The issues in these boxes are not intended to be comprehensive, but have been chosen because they are issues that have received attention from civil society organisations concerned with internet public policy issues in recent years. This first diagram is concerned with three primarily technical areas – standards, the administration and coordination of the internet (including critical internet resources) and the continually changing technological context for the delivery of internet services.

18. The next diagram looks at the subsidiary issues which have concerned civil society organisations within the broad category of "access". It is worth noting, with these and with all of the issue boxes throughout this mind-mapping exercise, that each individual box could itself be put at the heart of a new diagram and broken down into its own constituents. This mapping can be as detailed as the user wants or needs it to be.

19. The remaining slides of this kind are concerned with issues of a "broader", more public policy character, which emerge from the right hand side of the ellipse at the centre of this mapping model. This one, for example, is concerned with economic impacts and issues. Again, this is not intended to be a comprehensive listing, but a representation of those issues which have been of most concern to civil society actors within the internet space.

20. Some of the issues in every main category in this mind map approach overlap with other main categories. For example, some of the economic issues in the previous slide overlap with developmental issues such as those illustrated on this slide. Like access, developmental impact is an area that has been of concern to many civil society organisations.

21. This slide illustrates environmental impact issues, including – another aspect of this entire mapping exercise – both those which are considered positive from the viewpoint of the category concerned (here, in terms of environmental impact) and those which are considered negative.

22. This slide disaggregates some of the social policy issues that have exercised civil society organisations.

23. This slide is concerned with cultural issues which are closely related both to the social issues represented in the previous slide and the rights and political issues in those following. While they are separated in this current series of slides, which seeks to build up an overall picture, it should be remembered that these issue boxes often link closely with one another, both within and between categories. In some cases, the links between them represent consistency of impact or approach, but in others they may represent conflict or inconsistency.

24. Some of these potential areas of conflict or inconsistency arise in connection with discussions about rights – for example, debates about privacy/security and about what, if any, constraints apply to freedom of expression. Such debates occur within and between stakeholder communities.

25. The final segment of the mind map exercise is concerned with political issues, such as the relationship between the citizen and the state, and significantly overlaps with that on rights.

26. Having disaggregated the various categories within the initial mind map diagram at slide 16, which showed only broad categories, it is possible to bring it together again in a much more complex diagram such as this, which tries to map the broad range of issues that concern internet public policy entities and actors. As noted at the start of this description, a map such as this can look daunting at first, which is why it is important to build up the picture gradually. Once complete, however, it provides an underlying map of issues on which other maps can be overlaid – for example, on which decision-making entities, or the concerns and priorities of individual actors/stakeholders, can be located. Doing this can help individual organisations to identify their own priorities, the relationship between these and other issues, their relationship with decision-making fora, and the scope for productive partnerships between themselves and other actors.

27. The second main mapping exercise in this presentation looks at institutions, actors and stakeholders. Like that concerned with issues, it begins with a basic division into broad categories, and then disaggregates each of these in order to build up an overall picture which reflects the complexity and diversity involved.

28. This slide therefore represents a basic distribution of stakeholder categories within the internet public policy space. The distribution of stakeholder categories is often described as threefold – consisting of governments, the private sector and civil society. This picture is slightly more complex, recognising the role of intergovernmental organisations alongside the governments of nation states, and separating out the internet technical and professional community (while recognising that it overlaps with both the private sector and civil society). The following slides disaggregate each of these stakeholder categories.

29. This slide, for example, disaggregates the intergovernmental agencies concerned with internet public policy, some of which have a central role in decision-making relevant to the internet (such as the ITU) while others (such as development agencies) are more concerned with the impact that the internet has on their primary areas of concern.

    In this and the following four slides, tables to the right hand side illustrate some of the important differences which can be found between different entities within the stakeholder category concerned. With intergovernmental organisations, for example, there are distinctions between those which are global and those which are regional; between those which have universal membership and those where membership is optional; between those which make enforceable rules and those which coordinate policy. These distinctions usually form continua. Understanding these varying distinctions within broad stakeholder categories is an important part of understanding how these categories interact with internet and other public policy.

30. This slide similarly disaggregates the national government actors that are involved. Again it seeks to distinguish between those that are centrally involved in policymaking of importance to the working of the internet itself (such as ICT ministries and regulators), and those on the margins which are more concerned with how the internet is used. It also includes actors lying at the interface between the state, the private sector and the internet technical and professional community, or which may fall in any of these categories, such as ccTLD registries. Distinctions between national government entities include those concerned with policymaking responsibilities and those concerned with the ethos of government (and its openness to participation by other stakeholders).

31. This slide is concerned with bodies that lie within the internet technical and professional community. These include many of the entities at the “narrow” end of the internet governance spectrum, such as ICANN, the IETF, W3C and the Regional Internet Registries.

32. This slide looks at the private sector. Again, here, there are a number of interfaces with entities which are or may be considered part of national government or of the internet professional community in different places or in different ways. Another important distinction on this slide is that between the supply side of the ICT/internet industry, which is well represented in internet public policy discussion, and the demand side (e.g. major internet users such as the financial

services sector), which is poorly represented in it (particularly in the narrower dimensions of internet governance). This relatively marginal position of the non-ICT private sector is illustrated by the transparent box hanging from the right hand side of the left hand image.

33. Finally, this slide looks at civil society actors within the internet public policy space. As well as identifying groups of civil society actors, it also locates a number of individual civil society organisations within the frame. As with private sector users, mainstream civil society organisations have not been significantly active in internet public policy discussion, and their marginal participation is illustrated by a similar transparent box hanging from the right hand side of the left hand image. Important continua within civil society participation include those concerned with geography (North/South), ethos (conservative/reformist/radical) and purpose (policy/advocacy/implementation).

34. As slide 26 did with issues, this slide brings the cumulative aggregated slides concerned with internet institutions and actors together in one image. The only addition here is the representation of "individual users" at the right hand side of the picture, a large and expanding community which it has proved difficult for other actors to represent effectively.

    As with slide 26, the complexity of this slide may appear daunting at first, but it is hoped that the disaggregation in the previous slides will help users to understand the map as a whole, and also to locate themselves, their interests and their priorities and potential areas of activity within it.

35. The final two slides in this section try to add some additional dimensions to the mapping which has taken place so far. In this slide, the roles and responsibilities of some decision-making institutions or fora are overlaid on the map of internet issues that emerged from the mind-mapping exercise that concluded with slide 26. Locating decision-making bodies in this way can help civil society and other organisations to identify where they need to concentrate their advocacy and other work if they are to pursue their priority objectives.

36. This slide, by contrast, seeks to look inside a particular decision-making entity, ICANN, and locate some of the issues with which it is currently concerned across what might be called the "internet-intensity" spectrum, i.e. that ranging from "narrow" issues that are primarily located within the internet's own decision-making processes and "broader" issues which interface with wider public policy domains. It is intended to be illustrative rather than comprehensive – and in particular to illustrate the complex dynamics which can arise in areas of internet governance which may appear at first to be primarily technical in nature.

37. The presentation so far has observed the internet public policy space overall, and largely from a global point of view. However, there are big differences in the issues which are felt to be of major concern, and in the framework of institutions and actors that take part in internet public policy discussion, in different countries. The next five slides seek to illustrate these differences by looking at two specific countries, the United Kingdom and Kenya.

38. This map, which uses the colour coding described in slide 10, represents some of the issues which are currently being discussed within the UK internet policy space, ranging from narrower/technical issues on the left to broader/societal issues on the right.

39. This map represents the major actors within the UK policy space, including technical agencies, private sector bodies, government departments and civil society actors.

40. It should be possible to draw maps of the kind in slides 38 and 39 for all national internet environments, but they are likely to be very different from one another. This slide represents the issues which Kenyan internet specialists have identified as being particularly important in their country at present. These are clearly different from those in the UK, and the differences involved suggest the importance - for organisations that wish to engage in internet public policy - of looking at both global and national dimensions.

41. This map of Kenyan internet institutions and actors is likewise very different from that of the UK in slide 39. Quite different actors can play prominent roles in different countries (e.g. Nominet in the UK and KICTANet in Kenya); the structure of government engagement can be very different; and so can levels of private sector and civil society participation. Understanding the specifics of national internet environments is therefore important for those that wish to engage in policy debate within them.

42. The final slide in this section illustrates the role of the national and regional IGF processes in Kenya and East Africa. These engage stakeholders across the board and so overlay national and regional stakeholder maps, but they do not have decision-making force. While both IGFs make input upstream (to the East African and global IGFs), they are at least equally, and perhaps primarily, concerned with delivering outcomes and outputs downstream (at the national and regional levels).

43. The final sections of the presentation are concerned with ways of mapping civil society engagement, in terms of the issues that civil society organisations have addressed, the relationships they have with one another and with other stakeholder communities, and the dynamics of civil society partnerships and networks.

44. One way in which civil society (and other) organisations can look at their activities, priorities and partnerships is by overlaying these on the maps which were developed in the main mapping exercises earlier in this presentation. For example, they can overlay their own activities or priorities on this map of internet issues, which appeared as slide 26.

45. This slide, for example, overlays APC's main areas of activity in relation to internet public policy on that issues map. An overlay map like this could be developed for any organisation involved in internet public policy. Such overlay maps can be developed further, for example to show the intensity of activity undertaken, or the level of success that it is felt has been achieved. If maps illustrating the activities and priorities of different organisations are overlaid on one another, as well as on this issues map, this can help to identify where synergies exist between different organisations and/or where partnerships and networks can be productively developed.

46. A similar exercise can be undertaken with the relationships between an organisation and the overall multistakeholder environment, which was illustrated in this diagram, from slide 34.

47. However, in this case, a new mapping approach is suggested, as set out here. Again taking APC as an example, this map seeks to locate around it the different networks and partnerships which influence its work related to the internet and with which it does or could engage within that work. These include its internal membership network (to the right of the diagram), its partner relationships with other civil society organisations and with other civil society networks (to the left), and relationships with donors, intergovernmental/governmental agencies and private sector entities. As with slide 45, this could be used as a template for any organisation seeking to identify its actual and potential partners in the internet public policy space.

48. The last few slides in the presentation are concerned with mapping networks as such – both in practice and in theory.

49. This slide returns to the importance of considering different geographical dimensions of internet public policy issues and the different geographical tiers of decision-making entities and fora. It shows how civil society activities and networking can engage at the global, regional and national levels which were represented in slide 13 (the source for the underpinning image in the diagram).

50. Civil society organisations network across stakeholder communities as well as within civil society itself. Some issues are more susceptible to multistakeholder networking than others. This slide illustrates this with examples of two such issues. In the case of the internet and climate change, a group of diverse stakeholders has converged around a broad perception of the issues. A wide range of different stakeholder organisations has expressed support for the continuance of the IGF broadly along current lines, and this seems likely to be more influential if it acts collectively, perhaps in some form of coalition. Both of these represent convergences of thinking rather than networks in any formal sense, which illustrates that networking itself can be illustrated as a continuum from formality to informality.

51. This slide illustrates an important dimension of the interface between internet and mainstream public policy spaces which is not otherwise covered in the presentation. There is considerable discussion of mainstream rights issues, some of which concerns the internet and information rights, which is conducted primarily in human rights fora and based around the human rights conventions and legal instruments that draw on these. This is represented on the left of the diagram. There is also considerable discussion of “internet rights” issues, which is conducted largely in internet policy spaces and based around internet principles and ways of working. This is represented on the right of the diagram. Similar juxtapositions of mainstream and internet focused discourses could be identified in other areas, such as development and environmental policy. The question that arises here concerns the extent to which these discourses interact: whether there are strong distinctions between their core assumptions, participants and fora, represented by the vertical column in this diagram, and how far such distinctions are permeable.

52. This slide looks at the capabilities which are significant in enabling an organisation to be effective within a specific policy space: the importance of the issue in its own right, its saliency for the organisation under consideration, that organisation's level of expertise, and its capacity to influence relevant decision-makers. The diagram provides a space within which an organisation can locate its capabilities on any particular issue with which it wishes to engage: with higher levels of capability being located towards the centre of the page.

53. The diagram in slide 52 can be built upon in different ways. It can, for example, be used not just for one organisation but for a number, identifying the different strengths and weaknesses of different organisations and thereby helping to establish how a coalition or network of organisations with different capabilities might be brought together to address a specific issue. In this second diagram, a distinction is also drawn between a focused network, made up only of organisations which have high relevant capabilities; and a more diffuse, broader network which draws in organisations for which the issue is less important or which have less relevant expertise.

54. The final slide in the presentation adds one further point to this brief exploration of network dynamics. Another way of distinguishing between a broad and a narrow network in a particular policy space is to consider levels of relevance and consensus. A focused network will be made up only of organisations for which the issue is highly relevant and which share a high level of agreement in analysis, strategy and tactics. A broad network, on the other hand, can accommodate lower levels of saliency among its members and higher levels of disagreement between them. This diagram could be used to map relevance and consensus of a particular issue for a number of organisations in order to establish the scope for and potential participation in network activity around that issue.

55. The final four slides in the presentation are intended to enable individual organisations to locate their own activities, priorities and partnerships within the maps developed for the presentation.

56. This slide repeats slide 26 on internet public policy issues.

57. This slide repeats slide 34 on internet decision-making institutions and actors/stakeholders.

58. This slide repeats slide 47 on the networking relationships of individual organisations.

59. This slide repeats slide 52 on the capabilities of individual organisations.